

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 382

HE 015 645

AUTHOR Davis, Marianna W.
TITLE Report Number 3 of the Coalition for the Concerns of Blacks in Post-Secondary Education in South Carolina.
INSTITUTION Coalition for the Concerns of Blacks in Post-Secondary Education, Columbia, SC.
PUB DATE 1 Mar 80
NOTE 198p.; This paper was identified by a joint project of the Institute on Desegregation at North Carolina Central University and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education at The George Washington University.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; *Black Students; College Choice; College Faculty; College Programs; Colleges; Compliance (Legal); Educational Policy; Enrollment Trends; Federal Aid; Governing Boards; Government School Relationship; Land Grant Universities; *Master Plans; Public Policy; Questionnaires; Resource Allocation; State Aid; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *South Carolina; South Carolina State College; University of South Carolina

ABSTRACT

Information is presented on black access to and participation in the South Carolina state system of higher education and plans for desegregation of the system, in response to the 1978 Revised Criteria issued by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The only traditionally black, senior, public institution in the state is examined in "A Study of the History and Future Development of South Carolina State College: A Demographic Background Study" (Leonard Haynes, III). A master plan prepared by the Coalition for the Concerns of Blacks in Postsecondary Education (CCBE) in South Carolina is also presented. The plan contains data, recommendations, and planning charts on the mission and academic programs of South Carolina State College, public higher education enrollments, governing boards, nonacademic personnel, and faculty and administrative staff. Findings of a 1979 survey on postsecondary education concerns of selected black leaders in South Carolina and a sample of South Carolinians living outside the state are also presented, along with the questionnaire. Information on factors affecting college choice among black students is presented in the following paper: "Research Report and Policy Implications: Black Students at the University of South Carolina-Columbia" (A. Wade Smith). Additionally, excerpts from a dissertation are presented: "The Consequences of Federal and State Resource Allocation and Development Policies for Traditionally Black Land-Grant Institutions, 1862-1954" (William E. Trueheart). A 56-page appendix includes data on population trends, enrollments, financial aid, an executive summary of the report, and recommendations. (SW)

ED224382

REPORT NUMBER 3

OF THE

COALITION FOR THE CONCERNS OF BLACKS IN POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

IN

SOUTH CAROLINA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

GCDE
State of SC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MARCH 1, 1980

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

HE 015 645



NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA 27707

INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON HIGHER EDUCATION/INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION
COOPERATIVE PROJECT

This paper has been identified by a joint project of The Institute on Desegregation at North Carolina Central University and ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education at George Washington University. The purposes of this project are to identify, collect, and make available literature concerned with

- (1) the problems of minority students in higher education in general and
- (2) the problems of desegregation in historically black colleges and universities in particular.

New published and unpublished materials are reviewed and recommended by participants of the Institute on Desegregation's Interinstitutional Research Group (ID/IRG) for acquisition by ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. An annual bibliography of this material will be published under the names of ERIC and the Institute.

Various types of materials are being solicited, especially unpublished and unindexed materials, as well as publications, produced by faculty and staff members. Included in these may be unpublished faculty studies, institutional research studies, master's theses, monographs, papers presented at professional meetings, articles from general and scholarly periodicals, and conference and workshop proceedings not covered by ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

To be acceptable for inclusion in the ERIC system, the materials submitted for evaluation must be (1) reproducible, (2) of sufficient substance to be of value to practitioners, researchers, scholars, and others, and (3) not repetitive of materials that are already currently available.

If additional information is needed about this cooperative project or the criteria for selection of materials, please write or call the Director of the Institute on Desegregation at 919/683-6433, North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina 27707.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STEERING COMMITTEE - CCBE	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE NEED FOR NEW DEFINITIONS	3
III. A DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND STUDY	7
IV. CCBE'S MASTER PLAN	12
Mission of Public Higher Educational Institutions	12
Mission: South Carolina State College	12
Recommendation No. 1	19
Plan Chart on Mission	20
Academic Programs	19
Academic Programs: South Carolina State College	23
Recommendation No. 2	23
Plan Chart on Academic Programs	24
Student Enrollment	23
Black Student Enrollment	31
Recommendation No. 3	31
Plan Chart on Black Enrollment	33
Faculty, Administrative Staffs, Non-Academic Personnel, and Governing Boards	32
Faculty	32
Recommendation No. 4	40
Plan Chart on Black Faculty	41
Non-Academic Personnel	40
Recommendation No. 5	42
Governing Boards	42
Recommendation No. 6	47
Plan Chart on Governing Boards	48
V. THE SURVEY	49
CCBE'S Questionnaire	50

VI.	RESEARCH REPORT AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS: BLACK STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA—COLUMBIA	57
VII.	EXCERPTS FROM THE CONSEQUENCES OF FEDERAL AND STATE RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES FOR TRADITIONALLY BLACK LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS 1862-1954, A DISSERTATION	70
VIII.	SUMMARY AND FINAL COMMENTS	84

APPENDICES

A.	Gross Public Assistant Money Payments in South Carolina County: 1977-1978	87
B.	South Carolina Resident Population Urban and Rural in Sixteen Counties Foci of Study on Development of South Carolina State College 1970 and 1960	88
C.	Revised Criteria Specifying the Ingredients of Acceptable Plans to Desegregate State Systems of Public Higher Education	89
D.	Distribution of Faculty by Race and Discipline 4-Year Institutions	107
E.	Legal Basis for Affirmative Action	109
F.	Doctorate Degrees Awarded in South Carolina's Public Institutions by Discipline, Race, and Sex June 1977	112
G.	Number of Institutions and Total Enrollment in Fourteen States: Fall 1976	113
H.	Age 15-34 Population Projections and Number of Post-Secondary Institutions in Fourteen States	114
I.	Total Black Enrollment, Percentage by Level, 1976: Enrollment vs. Population, 1975 in Fourteen States	115
J.	Health Care Career Programs Offered in South Carolina Numbers of Programs and Graduates, 1973-1977	116
K.	1978 Opening Fall Enrollments by Race South Carolina Colleges and Universities	119
L.	1978 Opening Fall Enrollments by Race South Carolina Private Colleges and Universities	120
M.	Black/White Employment at Public Technical Institutions in South Carolina	122
N.	1978-79 Appropriations for Current Operations: South Carolina Senior Public Colleges and Universities	124
O.	Scholarships and Fellowships: Expenditures, South Carolina Senior Public Colleges and Universities, 1976-77	125
P.	The Scope and Impact of Selected Federal Programs	126
Q.	In Partial Response to the July 3, 1979, Request from OCR for Additional Information on the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education	138
R.	Favorable Job Outlook and Black Underrepresentation, Southern Region, 1980	142
S.	Executive Summary and Highlights	143

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Full-Time Enrollment, Postsecondary Institutions in South Carolina, Fall 1977	13
2.	1978 Opening Fall Enrollments by Race South Carolina Colleges and Universities	14
3.	Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded, Black and White Graduates, Senior Public Institutions in South Carolina, June 1977-July 1978	15
4.	Master and First Professional Degrees Awarded by South South Carolina's Public Institutions, by Discipline, Race and Sex-June 1977	16
5.	Academic Degree Programs at South Carolina State: 1976-77	17
6.	Number of High School Graduates and Number Entering College, Nine South Carolina Counties, 1980-84	18
7.	Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Black Students in Fourteen States; Percentage in Selected Fields, 1975-76	21
8.	First Professional Degrees Awarded in Selected Fields; in Fourteen States: Percent Awarded to Black Students, 1975-76	22
9.	Black/White Enrollment by Type of Institution in Fourteen States, Fall 1976	25
10.	Black Enrollment Percentage at South Carolina's Senior Public Colleges and Universities, Fall 1977	26
11.	Federal and State Financial Aid Programs for Students, Four States	28
12.	Federal Obligations to Universities and Colleges by Agency in Fourteen States, 1974-75	29
13.	Tuition and Fees, Undergraduate Students, South Carolina Senior Public Colleges and Universities, 1977-78	30
14.	Black/White Faculty by Rank at Senior Public Institutions in South Carolina: 1978-79	36
15.	Average Salaries: Full-Time Equivalent Teaching Faculty, South Carolina Senior Public Colleges and Universities, Fall 1977	39

THE STEERING COMMITTEE OF CCBE

Mr. Rodney Albert
Businessman

Dr. Annabelle S. Boykin
Housewife

Mr. James E. Clyburn
Commissioner, State Human Affairs Commission

Dr. Milton Kimpson
Director, Office of Health, Education, and Human Services
The Governor's Staff

Mr. Isaac McGraw
Member, Richland District One School Board

Dr. M. Maceo Nance, Jr. (Ex-Officio)
President, South Carolina State College

Mr. Kay Patterson
Legislator, South Carolina House of Representatives

Dr. Henry Ponder
President, Benedict College

Dr. Anna Reuben
Academic Dean, Morris College

Mr. Hiram Spain, Jr.
State Government Official

Dr. George B. Thomas
President, Voorhees College

Mr. Isaac Williams
State Director, NAACP

Dr. Fredericka Young
Professor, Claflin College

Dr. Marianna W. Davis
Coordinator and Author
Professor, Benedict College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CCBE owes special gratitude to the Southern Education Foundation of Atlanta, Georgia. Mr. Elridge McMillan, Executive Director of the Foundation, and Mrs. Lynne D. Brown, Consultant, have always given guidance to CCBE through regional conferences sponsored by SEF. Most importantly, however, is the Foundation's funding of CCBE's proposal that made this publication possible.

We are also grateful to our three major consultants: Dr. Leonard Hayes, III of the Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges in Washington, D.C.; Dr. Paul B. Mohr, Sr., Vice President for Academic Affairs at Norfolk State University in Virginia; Dr. Gloria Scott, Vice President for Academic Affairs at Clark College in Atlanta, Georgia.

CCBE is also appreciative to the staff of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education for allowing the Coordinator to use the public records without difficulty. The State Human Affairs Commission, as usual, was most helpful in assisting CCBE in the interpretation of employment figures at postsecondary institutions.

Finally, of great importance to CCBE, we acknowledge the many black citizens across South Carolina who read the drafts of this report and who participated in our survey.

I. INTRODUCTION

TITLE VI of The Civil Rights Act of 1964: No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. (42 U.S.C. 200d)

In early 1979, the Office for Civil Rights, Region IV, United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, visited the senior public colleges and universities of South Carolina. Under the law of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the visiting teams focused on the status of each institution's movement toward desegregation of all aspects of its system. As a result of these visits, the public higher education system of the State of South Carolina is mandated to submit a Master Plan to HEW, outlining its timetable and procedures for desegregation of the system.

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia in Adams v. Califano, Civil Action No. 3095-70, Second Supplemental Order (D.D.C. April 1, 1977), moving from a lawsuit initiated in 1970, Adams v. Richardson, Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, specifically directed HEW to develop CRITERIA for the development of Master Plans for state public systems of higher education, particularly the "Adams" states.

The CRITERIA (revised) were announced publicly on February 2, 1978 by HEW and were subsequently published in the Federal Register. As specified by the Court, the CRITERIA include specific commitments from public higher educational institutions concerning:

1. Admission, recruitment, and retention of students;
2. Placement and duplication of program offerings among institutions;
3. Role and enhancement of black institutions;
4. Changes in the racial composition of the faculties involved.

The revised CRITERIA, therefore, were issued to assist states in the preparation of master plans of desegregation—as part of the process of securing voluntary compliance (see Appendix A: Revised Criteria).

As stated by Frank Adams in his article, "Black Colleges Under Attack" in Southern Exposure, Summer 1979, five steps need to be taken to build up black institutions:

1. New academic programs
2. Capital outlay for new buildings
3. Special faculty and staff development programs
4. Financial support
5. No mandated numbers or quotas of white administrators, faculty, or students in these institutions as long as they are in keeping with the law and protective of the rights of all American citizens who wish to apply to them.

In light of the court rulings in the original ten Adams' states, a group of black citizens in South Carolina organized The Coalition for the Concerns of Blacks in Postsecondary Education (CCBE) in South Carolina, in 1975. Through small grants from the Southern Education Foundation and the South Carolina Committee for the Humanities, as well as through private donations, CCBE has held eight grass-roots meetings across the state, held three state-wide meetings in Columbia, made numerous appearances on television and radio, conducted a state-wide survey on issues concerning Blacks in higher education in South Carolina, and published two substantial reports. This report, Report No. 3, is CCBE's response to the CRITERIA as submitted by HEW.

Marianna W. Davis
Coordinator and Author
CCBE
Post Office Box 3097
Columbia, South Carolina 29230

II. THE NEED FOR NEW DEFINITIONS

Far too many terms are used to camouflage serious and critical issues in the process of desegregating educational institutions, as perceived by both Title VI and the Constitution of the United States. Since the extent to which Blacks have gained meaningful access to colleges and universities in South Carolina is indeed limited, CCBE believes that a re-examination of definitions and a structure of new definitions need addressing. In this way, educational, political, legal, and grass-roots people can, perhaps, discuss desegregation issues from a common set of meanings—at least by those definitions offered by CCBE.

Open-Door Admissions: Acceptance of students regardless of scores made on traditional entrance examinations, such as the Scholastic Achievement Test (SAT). Admissions should be predicated on a variety of criteria. Open-door admissions colleges must have companion programs which will ensure academic progression to college degrees and satisfying careers.

Racially and Educationally Disadvantaged: A student who, because of race and education, has been denied full access to fulfilling educational needs and opportunity to participate in sound educational programs, beginning at the preschool level.

Economically Disadvantaged: A student who does not have the finances to matriculate as a full-time student, and who, therefore, has to depend on outside support or to work full or part-time jobs.

Bi-lingual: In South Carolina, black students often speak a "different language," one that represents the home environment as it serves the purpose of communication. Across the forty-six counties, these language patterns differ from one another, but there is commonality in style and meaning. Toward providing programs that allow black students full opportunity to participate in higher education, where the language is "standard public," instructional programs should be linguistically diverse so that black students can be bi-lingual. An understanding of the unique features of the language of black students leads to strategies for teaching them "standard public" English. (See the recent Ann Arbor, Michigan case.)

Potential: Potential is often a latent quality. It has to be discovered, nurtured, and rewarded. Standardized tests can not isolate or identify potential. Rather, potential has to be discovered and encouraged by sensitive teachers.

Academic Competence: Academic competence is not the same as "psycho-babble," the dramatic oration of sophisticated expressions that do not correlate with an individual's ability to think or to analyze. Academic competence does not have anything to do with a student's ability to use the subjunctive mood, a characteristic of syntax in the English language. Rather, academic competence relates specifically to one's ability to learn, understand, analyze, and communicate what has been learned. Thus, learning is a process, not merely a product.

Bi-cultural Curriculum: A curriculum that offers subject matter representing ideas and practices of both the minority and majority cultures is said to be bi-cultural. CCBE's concern here relates to black/white cultures. Thus, for example, in a course in American literature, the course syllabus should cover in equal numbers both black and white literary figures and their works. One who teaches such a course must be well-trained in both areas of the literature.

The New Professor (teacher): Literature abounds with discussions of the "new" student, but little is offered on the need for "new teachers." Colleges and universities need personnel (teachers and others) who not only understand the concerns of new students, but also can meet the needs of these students. Teachers need to be especially sensitive to the values, mores, language, and personal goals of black students. American history, for example, must be taught for what it is, without the prejudice of a professor negating truth.

A Good Library: CCBE does not define a "good library" merely by the number of volumes or by its level of budget under education and general expenditures. A good library at a public institution is one that has a substantial collection on the black experience, and materials written by Blacks on other subjects. Additionally, the rare book collection should contain original or printed copies of works on early ideas as offered by Blacks, such as Black Phalanx, 1888; Negro Pamphlets, 1862-1918; Journal of Negro History; Black Women's Era, 1852, and Good Hope Plantation Birth Register, 1760-1857, Charleston, South Carolina. This means, therefore, that all students can pursue research topics on the black experience in South Carolina and in the United States.

Remedial Curriculum: Remedial does not connote ignorance. Rather, it means upgrading for the purpose of progressing students to their goals in the educational system. A remedial curriculum must not be a "revolving door" mechanism where students are led to believe that they are indeed incompetent. Therefore, a remedial curriculum is one that carries several components: the learning of skills, the learning of self-worth, the further developing of personal goals for satisfying careers, and content and experiences designed to fill the gap and move students to productive work.

Distribution of Black Students: CCBE is strongly opposed to "packing" black students into general studies or education degree programs. Rather, students should be distributed according to their personal goals and interests, and to the needs of the broader society (where jobs are available). The distribution of black students means that these students are enrolled in and graduated from ALL degree programs across the curriculum.

Barriers, Impediments, Stumbling Blocks: The barriers, impediments, and stumbling blocks that reduce or limit the participation of black students in the senior public institutions, as seen by CCBE, are (1) limited financial support, (especially fellowships and scholarships); (2) admissions policies; (3) insensitive teachers; (4) ineffective counseling programs; (5) racially biased placement services; (6) limited black role models among all faculty and administrative personnel; (7) the effort among institutions to find and highlight the "super" black student; (8) limited access to research opportunities and teaching assistantships.

Enhancing the Traditionally Black Institution: Enhancing of the black institution means the creation and/or upgrading of academic programs--with adequate financial support; significant increase in the operational budget of the institution; adequate funds to attract and hold highly qualified teachers, especially black doctorates and researchers; adequate funds for capital improvements; policies to provide unique services and opportunities for students through open-door admissions and financial-aid; maintenance of a black top administration, e.g., chancellor, president, vice presidents, deans, department heads; providing economic resources to ensure high quality educational experiences.

Evaluation of Students: Standardized tests are much too questionable for CCBE. Success stories of thousands of Americans (and South Carolinians) seldom relate to high test scores. Rather, other meaningful variables appear to be significant in determining whether a person becomes successful in life. Thus, evaluation of a student should encompass other variables in addition to scores on standardized tests--already culturally biased.

Significant Statistical Reporting: Inconsistency of data in reporting is evident in materials submitted to the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. For example, one senior public institution refused to show its number of graduates by race, while all other public institutions complied. Thus, when public decision-makers debate policy, they must do so on insufficient or skewed evidence. Further, mere statistical data do not imply equal access of black students to higher educational opportunities. Thus, significant statistical reporting means the compilation of data in ways that shall give clear, accurate, and analytical pictures of any given situation. For example, to determine access of black students in a program to prepare Registered Nurses at an institution, the collected data should show:

1. Number of entering students by race, sex, residence, etc.
2. Number of students qualifying for financial aid as based on need, by race, sex, etc.
3. Number of drop-outs, by race--showing specific reasons for non-retention as stated by the students who drop-out.
4. Number of graduates, by race, sex, etc.
5. Data showing progression of students, from entry date to graduation date, by race, sex, socio-economic factors, etc.
6. System by which students are selected for intern experiences.
7. Academic support experiences, including formal and informal faculty interaction.
8. System (detailed) used for placement of graduates.
9. System used for follow-up of graduates.

CCBE believes that a significant statistical reporting system should be part of the process of education, public and private, and it believes that such record-keeping is not highly time-consuming, given personnel who know how to maintain records, produce a communication format for reporting data, and use appropriate equipment.

Meaningful Participation of Blacks on Governing Boards: CCBE interprets meaningful participation of Blacks on governing boards in South Carolina as:

1. At least thirty-one percent Blacks shall be seated on each governing board, including the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education and the boards of trustees.
2. Blacks named/elected to such boards and/or commissions shall be conversant about the issues and problems in higher education.
3. Blacks named/elected to such boards and/or commissions shall be responsive to the peculiar needs of the black community.
4. Blacks named/elected shall be qualified for such positions, shall have potential for leadership roles, and shall have established track records germane to Black people.
5. They shall be meaningful participants in budgeting decisions.
6. They shall be meaningful participants in discussions of duplication of academic programs.
7. They shall be meaningful participants in discussions on articulation between senior institutions and technical and/or two-year institutions.

III. A STUDY OF THE HISTORY AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF SOUTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE: A DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND STUDY*

South Carolina State College was founded with a particular population in mind. Traditionally, this college has been the Black land-grant institution for South Carolina. Presently, the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education has charged South Carolina State College with serving its region based on public service needs for its geographic region. The purpose of this demographic background study then is to delineate areas where there are indeed public service needs.

South Carolina State is a part of a tripartite state higher education system. Within South Carolina there is the university system, the state colleges (South Carolina State College is here), and the two-year institutions. In addition, there is an independent sector consisting of private two- and four-year institutions. The state's Commission on Higher Education has recommended that all post-bachelors' work continue to be at the state's public colleges and universities. South Carolina State could capitalize on this fact. However, the University of South Carolina and three satellite campuses are in a fifty mile radius of South Carolina State College. Articulation coordination could prove a new mission for South Carolina State College and the two-year campuses of the University of South Carolina.

South Carolina State College is located in Orangeburg, Orangeburg County, South Carolina. In a fifty-mile radius of the city of Orangeburg are the following whole or partial counties: Aiken, Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell, Berkeley, Calhoun, Clarendon, Colleton, Dorchester, Hampton, Kershaw, Lexington, Richland, and Sumter. The county of Charleston has also been included in this demographic background study. It is not in the fifty-mile radius of South Carolina State College. The city of Charleston is approximately seventy-five miles from Orangeburg. However, located in Charleston are Baptist College at Charleston, Citadel Military College of South Carolina, College of Charleston, Medical University of South Carolina, and Trident Technical College. Outside of Richland county where the city of Columbia is located, there is not another major educational center in close proximity to South Carolina State College. The city and county of Charleston has been included in this study because of the location of the above named schools whose curricula offerings will be compared with South Carolina State College and other schools within the fifty-mile boundaries.

There is a consortium in the Charleston area of the state which consists of the area's colleges and universities. A similar model should be explored by South Carolina State College to assure that it progresses as a regional institution and develops unique programs of

*The section was developed by Dr. Leonard Haynes, III of the Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges.

high quality. Participation by South Carolina State College and other colleges and universities in its region with the Advisory Committee on Graduate Teacher Education would alleviate unnecessary future duplication of graduate teacher education programs.

Benedict College, Allen University, Columbia College, the University of South Carolina-Main Campus, Midlands Technical College, Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary, and Columbia Bible College are located in Columbia. Located in Sumter county are Sumter Area Technical College, Morris College, and the University of South Carolina at Sumter. Besides South Carolina State College in Orangeburg are Claflin College and Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College. Voorhees College is in Denmark - Bamberg county. There is a branch of the University of South Carolina in Salkehatchie, Allendale county. Aiken Technical College and the University of South Carolina at Aiken are in Aiken of Aiken county. All other counties wholly or partially inclusive of the aforementioned boundaries--Barnwell, Berkeley, Calhoun, Clarendon, Colleton, Dorchester, Hampton, Kershaw, and Lexington--have no higher education institutions located there.

The University of South Carolina at Aiken offers the Associate degrees in Arts and Letters, Nursing, and Science. Bachelors' programs in Business Administration, Education, Science and Mathematics, and Social and Behavioral Sciences are available. The 1977-78 enrollment was 1,211 students and 49 full-time teaching faculty.

The University of South Carolina at Salkehatchie offers the A.A. and A.S. degrees and had a 1977-78 enrollment of 266 students with a full-time teaching faculty of 13. The other two-year branch of the University of South Carolina is at Sumter. The Sumter campus was operated in conjunction with Clemson University from 1966-73 and joined the Carolina family July, 1973. The 1977-78 academic year enrollment was 479 students with full-time faculty of 21.

The University of South Carolina offers a Military Campus Program in addition to ROTC programs similar to the one at South Carolina State College. This program was begun in 1972 at Fort Jackson in Columbia, Shaw Air Force Base in Sumter, and the U. S. Naval Base in Charleston. In addition the University of South Carolina offers the Project Afloat College Education and the Serviceman's Opportunity College. No such public service programs for the military community were listed in the South Carolina State College catalog. Such programs as the above offer flexibility in admissions, credit, and residence requirements.

The competitive main campus of University of South Carolina in Columbia has a full-time undergraduate enrollment of 13,191 and a full-time graduate enrollment of 8,353. Curricula programs include the following: Business Administration, Criminal Justice, Education, Engineering, General Studies, Health and Physical Education, Humanities and Social Sciences, Journalism, Librarianship, Nursing, Pharmacy, Science and Mathematics, Social Work, Speech Pathology and Audiology.

Less competitive South Carolina State College, with an undergraduate enrollment of 2,909 and a graduate enrollment of 617, curricula offerings include Accounting, Art, Biology, Business Administration, Chemistry, Child Development, Dramatic Arts, Education

(Elementary, Health and Physical, Special), Engineering Technology, Food and Nutrition, French, History, Home Economics, Industrial Education, Library Service, Mathematics, Medical Technology, Music, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Social Studies, Sociology, Spanish, and Speech Pathology and Audiology.

If South Carolina State College is to progress in its role as a regional state institution, serving the perceived needs of its region, expansion of programs in the maintenance and promotion of health is needed. Presently, the only pre-professional or para-professional programs in the health area offered by South Carolina State College are Medical Technology and Speech Pathology and Audiology. Obviously, the Medical University of South Carolina has taken the primary responsibility for training the state's professional and allied health workers.

In general South Carolina State College needs an increase in para-professional and pre-professional programs. Comparative to the white land-grant college of South Carolina (Clemson University), South Carolina State College only offers an Engineering Technology curriculum. Clemson offers five Engineering programs. Clemson's curricula offerings include Accounting, Administrative Management, Agricultural (Economics, Economic Biology, Economic Zoology, Community and Rural Development and Education, Engineering), Agronomy, Animal Industries, Architecture, Building Construction, Ceramic Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Chemistry, Dairy Science, Engineering (Analysis, Civil, Electrical, Mechanical, and Technology), Education (Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary), English, Financial Management, Food Science, Forest Management, Geology, History, Industrial Education, Industrial Management, Mathematics, Medical Technology, Microbiology, Modern Languages, Nursing, Physics, Physical Sciences, Plant Sciences, Political Science, Pre-Architecture, Preprofessional Health, Pre-Pharmacy, Pre-Veterinary, Psychology, Recreation and Park Administration, Science Teaching, Sociology, Textile Chemistry and Science, Textile Technology, Wood Utilization, and Zoology. Clemson is a competitive school with an undergraduate full-time enrollment of 8,255 and a graduate full-time enrollment of 8,606.

Less competitive Claflin College, also located in Orangeburg, has an enrollment of 747 full-time students. Claflin is basically a liberal arts institution offering programs at the bachelors' level in Art, Biology, Chemistry, Education (Elementary, Physical, Secondary), English, French, Mathematics, Music, Religion, and Social Sciences.

Competitive Citadel Military College in Charleston has a full-time undergraduate enrollment of 2,400 and a full-time graduate enrollment of 300. Citadel offers pre-professional curricula in Medicine and Law along with programs in Biology, Business Administration, Chemistry, Civil Engineering, Education, Electrical Engineering, English, History, Mathematics, Modern Languages, Physical Education, Physics, Political Science, and Psychology.

The Baptist College at Charleston is another liberal arts institution. With a full-time undergraduate student population of 1,210, graduates may finish with any of the following majors: Art, Biology, Business Administration, Chemistry, Economics, English, Elementary

and Secondary Education, Health and Physical Education, History, Language, Mathematics, Music, Philosophy, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Religion, Sociology, Speech and Dramatic Arts.

The College of Charleston has a full-time undergraduate enrollment of 2,252 and a full-time graduate enrollment of 148. Major programs are Biology, Business Administration, Chemistry, Classical Languages, Economics, Elementary and Secondary Education, English, Fine Arts, French, German, History, Marine Biology, Mathematics, Philosophy, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Special Education, Urban Studies. Pre-professional programs include Dentistry, Law, Medical Technology, Medicine, Pharmacy, Veterinary Medicine.

The Southern Regional Education Board is another advisory unit to coordinate programs within regions and discourage duplication of academic programs. The state of South Carolina Commission on Higher Education has recommended that senior higher education institutions not offer occupationally oriented programs when in close proximity to a two-year institution. On the other hand, the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education suggested that the two-year institution not offer general education courses when in close proximity to a senior higher education institution.

Duplication of program offerings in the field of Education is observed. However, the state Commission on Higher Education has proposed that particular teacher inservice programs be more locally located. Other community service programs based on local and regional industries need to be investigated and pursued further by South Carolina State College. For example, South Carolina State College offers no academic or public service programs in the field of agriculture and natural resources, architecture, or textile sciences.

In outlining goals for 1979 and the immediate future, the state Commission on Higher Education for South Carolina has proposed that programs in the following areas be expanded and/or developed: community service, continuing education, health promotion and maintenance, environmental education and energy conservation, and human services.

Note Appendix A, "Gross Public Assistance Money Payments in South Carolina by County 1977-78" that counties earlier mentioned as having no higher education and/or postsecondary institution in their immediate proximity have relatively lower public assistance payments (Barnwell, Berkeley, Calhoun, Clarendon, Colleton, Dorchester, Hampton, Kershaw and Lexington). The average per capita income for all counties is between \$3,500 - \$4,000.

From Appendix B, "South Carolina Resident Population Urban and Rural," it is apparent that with the exception of Richland and Charleston counties, the rural populations of all other counties in this study far exceeds the urban populations. Information such as this is crucial in planning new curricula program offerings. In comparison to the other postsecondary schools included in this study, South Carolina State College could be the first in its region to offer programs based on rural population needs and an agricultural way of life. For example, South Carolina State College could begin majors in areas such as

Agricultural Economics, Community and Rural Development and Education, Agricultural Engineering. Clemson University could be used as a model institution here.

Many of the counties included in this background study have relatively small populations and land areas. Almost all of the counties have population counts less than 100,000, with many counties having population counts of less than 50,000. There is one metropolitan area within a fifty-mile radius of Orangeburg. Orangeburg county is one of the larger counties population countwise.

Hence, South Carolina State College faces a twofold mission. It must increase its viability as a regional state public senior land-grant college. This can be done by assessing its regions' educational and public service needs and proceeding to include such data in new program development whether it be a continuing education program, inservice training, or major areas of study. Secondly, South Carolina State College must continue to respond to the Black population needs of the state. As the data shows, the historically Black college continues to have the largest percentage of Black enrollment and graduates the largest percentage of Black college graduates.

IV. CCBE'S MASTER PLAN

A. Mission of Public Higher Educational Institutions

In South Carolina, fifty-three postsecondary institutions are operative: 12 public senior, 20 private senior, 16 public two-year, and 5 private two-year institutions. These institutions enroll a total of 92,484 full-time students (see Table 1).

Within the twelve senior public institutions, three universities are established: Clemson University offers degrees at three levels, and it emphasizes sciences, agriculture, and engineering. The University of South Carolina offers degrees at four levels, and it emphasizes arts and sciences, education, business, and law. The Medical University of South Carolina offers degrees at four levels. The remaining nine institutions are mainly undergraduate, liberal-arts colleges, with The Citadel continuing a military tradition and Winthrop College continuing a strong emphasis in home economics. Of the nine schools, five offered master's degrees as of June 1, 1977 (see Tables 2 and 3).

1. Mission: South Carolina State College

In this report, CCBE shall address mainly the mission of South Carolina State College at Orangeburg, the only traditionally black senior public institution in the system and the Land-Grant College for Blacks, 1896.

South Carolina State College was founded in 1896, and its mission was to provide college training for black students in the State of South Carolina. This mission is still fundamentally the same in 1979. However, where the earlier curriculum was mainly one of teacher training and trades training (brick-laying, carpentry, etc.), the college has extended its curriculum to thirty-one undergraduate programs, as of the 1976-77 academic year (see Table 5).

In response to the 93 percent black enrollment at the undergraduate level, the high percentage of blacks across South Carolina who still prefer to attend a traditionally black college, and the whites who prefer to attend a public college within short driving distances of their residences, the mission of South Carolina State College needs to be broadened to allow for a more diversified curricula and degree programs.

Table 6 shows nine counties that are immediately served by South Carolina State College. Of course, data from the college shows that its students come from each of the forty-six counties in South Carolina as well as from other states and from several foreign countries. Thus, on the basis of the data in Table 6 and of the historical enrollment data, South Carolina State should be projected to a maximum enrollment of 6,000 full-time students by 1990. By 1985, the enrollment should reach 4,500 full-time students.

TABLE 1

FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT, POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS IN SOUTH CAROLINA, FALL 1977

Public Senior Institutions	Enrollment	Public 2-year Institutions	Enrollment	Private Senior Institutions	Enrollment	Private 2 yr. Institutions	Enrollment
Clemson Univ.	9,710	Aiken Tech	560	Allen Univ.	381	Anderson Col	961
Coll.-Charleston	3,721	Beaufort Tech	593	Baptist Col.	1,285	Clinton Col	173
Francis Marion	1,685	Chesterfield/ Marlboro	419	Benedict Col.	2,025	Friendship Col	128
Lander	1,393	Denmark Tech	791	Bob Jones Univ.	3,997	North Greenville	480
Medical Univ.	2,348	Florence/ Darlington	1,649	Central Wesleyan	349	Spartanburg Methodist	944
S. C. State	3,343	Greenville Tech.	3,041	Clafflin College	892		
The Citadel	2,155	Horry/Georgetown	1,250	Coker College	282		
USC-Aiken	1,034	Midlands Tech.	3,237	Columbia Bible	607		
USC-Coastal	1,218	Orangeburg/Calhoun	1,103	Columbia College	846		
USC*	17,641	Piedmont Tech.	1,281	Converse College	782		
USC-Spartanburg	1,322	Spartanburg Tech.	1,125	Erskine College	695		
Winthrop	3,131	Sumter Tech.	755	Furman Univ.	2,051		
		Tri-County Tech.	1,411	Limestone College	681		
		Trident Tech.	3,187	Lutheran Theo.	130		
		Williamsburg Tech.	411	Morris College	663		
		York Tech.	1,011	Newberry College	810		
				Presbyterian Col.	812		
				Southern Method	66		
				Voorhees College	944		
				Wofford	975		
TOTALS	48,701		21,824		19,273		2,686

*Includes Regional Campuses

Total-All Institutions: 92,484

Source: Higher Education General Information Survey, USOE, "Fall Enrollment & Compliance Report," 1977.

TABLE 2
1978 OPENING FALL ENROLLMENTS BY RACE
SOUTH CAROLINA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

	<u>UNDERGRADUATE</u>				<u>GRADUATE</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>			
	<u>WHITE & OTHER*</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>% BLACK</u>	<u>WHITE & OTHER*</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>% BLACK</u>	<u>WHITE & OTHER*</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>% BLACK</u>
<u>PUBLIC SENIOR</u>												
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY	8,899	153	9,052	1.7	2,234	41	2,275	1.8	11,133	194	11,327	1.7
COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON	4,694	241	4,935	4.9	205	24	229	10.5	4,899	265	5,164	5.1
FRANCIS MARION COLLEGE	1,950	273	2,223	12.3	340	140	480	29.2	2,290	413	2,703	15.3
LANDER COLLEGE	1,414	280	1,694	16.5	-	-	-	-	1,414	280	1,694	16.5
MEDICAL UNIVERSITY	1,039	70	1,109	6.3	946	37	983	3.8	1,985	107	2,092	5.1
S.C. STATE COLLEGE	41	2,947	2,988	98.6	75	374	449	83.3	116	3,321	3,437	96.6
THE CITADEL	2,306	71	2,377	3.0	790	186	976	19.0	3,096	257	3,353	7.7
U.S.C.-COLUMBIA	14,146	1,892	16,038	11.8	6,861	622	7,483	8.3	20,807	2,514	23,321	10.8
U.S.C.-AIKEN	1,384	236	1,620	14.6	-	-	-	-	1,384	236	1,620	14.6
U.S.C.-COASTAL	1,621	131	1,752	7.1	-	-	-	-	1,621	131	1,752	7.1
U.S.C.-SPARTANBURG	2,166	124	2,290	5.4	-	-	-	-	2,166	124	2,290	5.4
WINTHROP COLLEGE	<u>3,017</u>	<u>534</u>	<u>3,551</u>	15.0	<u>949</u>	<u>140</u>	<u>1,089</u>	12.9	<u>3,966</u>	<u>674</u>	<u>4,640</u>	14.5
<u>SUBTOTAL PUBLIC SENIOR</u>	<u>42,677</u>	<u>6,952</u>	<u>49,629</u>	14.0	<u>12,200</u>	<u>1,564</u>	<u>13,764</u>	11.4	<u>54,877</u>	<u>8,516</u>	<u>63,393</u>	13.4
<u>2-YEAR REGIONAL CAMPUSES</u>												
U.S.C.-BEAUFORT	402	87	489	17.8	-	-	-	-	402	87	489	17.8
U.S.C.-GENERAL STUDIES	1,119	402	1,521	26.4	-	-	-	-	1,119	402	1,521	26.4
U.S.C.-LANCASTER	620	101	721	14.0	-	-	-	-	620	101	721	14.0
U.S.C.-SALKEHATCHIE	279	72	351	20.5	-	-	-	-	279	72	351	20.5
U.S.C.-SUMTER	676	138	814	17.0	-	-	-	-	676	138	814	17.0
U.S.C.-UNION	<u>198</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>250</u>	20.8	-	-	-	-	<u>198</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>250</u>	20.8
<u>SUBTOTAL 2-YEAR REGIONAL</u>	<u>3,294</u>	<u>852</u>	<u>4,146</u>	20.5					<u>3,294</u>	<u>852</u>	<u>4,146</u>	20.5

* Includes Non-Resident Alien, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic.

Source: South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education Statistical Abstract, March 1979.

TABLE 3

BACCALAUREATE DEGREES AWARDED, BLACK & WHITE GRADUATES, SENIOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS IN SOUTH CAROLINA, JUNE 1977 - JULY 1978

Discipline	INSTITUTIONS																										Totals	
	Glenn		College Charleston		Francis Marion		Lander		Medical Univ.		S.C. State		The Citadel		U.S.C.		U.S.C. Aiken		U.S.C. Coastal		U.S.C. Spartanburg		Winthrop					
	B	W	B	W	B	W	B	W	B	W	B	W	B	W	B	W	B	W	B	W	B	W	B	W	B	W		
Agriculture & Nat. Res.	1	181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	181		
Architecture	0	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	109		
Area Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		
Biological Sciences	2	122	2	80	1	22	1	7	0	0	25	1	1	31	9	138	0	9	0	12	0	11	7	23	48	456		
Business & Manage.	0	102	8	93	3	49	8	71	0	0	100	2	1	112	34	518	0	11	1	35	1	61	10	57	166	1111		
Communications	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	192	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	20	199		
Computer Sciences	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	34		
Education	3	198	5	81	3	64	9	69	0	0	226	3	1	46	43	390	4	28	4	41	3	45	17	166	318	1131		
Engineering	8	477	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	26	0	2	35	7	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	663		
Fine & Applied Arts	0	0	1	33	0	0	0	9	0	0	10	0	0	0	5	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	19	171		
Foreign Language	2	19	1	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	53		
Health Professions	2	89	0	3	0	0	0	4	6	192	20	1	0	0	4	281	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	570		
Home Economics	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	29	22	41		
Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Letters	1	41	0	40	1	10	0	8	0	0	7	0	0	17	5	98	0	7	0	4	0	4	1	13	15	242		
Library Science	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Mathematics	1	40	2	14	3	12	1	4	0	0	13	0	0	23	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	24	108		
Physical Sciences	0	22	0	31	1	6	0	4	0	0	13	0	0	17	4	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	125		
Psychology	2	44	3	44	2	14	5	14	0	0	23	0	0	9	12	131	1	9	2	14	0	14	4	21	54	314		
Public Affairs	0	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	105		
Social Sciences	3	127	6	78	15	77	4	11	0	0	45	0	1	85	38	278	3	6	3	10	0	16	9	40	127	728		
Interdisciplinary Stud	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	158	3	8	0	29	10	57	0	0	47	256		
TOTALS	26	3685	28	507	32	270	98	227	6	192	525	8	6	378	219	2648	11	78	10	145	14	208	84	395	968	6588		
% of TOTALS	1.49		5.28		10.60		10.98		3.03		98.50		1.56		7.91		12.50		6.48		6.31		13.94		12.79			

Source: South Carolina Commission on Higher Education.

TABLE 4

MASTER & FIRST PROFESSIONAL DEGREES AWARDED BY SOUTH CAROLINA'S PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS, BY DISCIPLINE, RACE, & SEX - JUNE 1977

Discipline	Public Institutions																								Totals											
	CITADEL				CLEMSON*				COLLEGE CHARLESTON				FRANCIS MARION				MEDICAL UNIVERSITY				S. C. STATE								U.S.C.				WINTHROP			
	Black		White		Black		White		Black		White		Black		White		Black		White		Black		White		Black		White		Black		White		Black		White	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M		
Agriculture & Nat. Res.							7	35																								0	0	7	35	
Architecture & Env. Des.							4	35																								0	0	4	35	
Biological Sciences							13	35	0	0	0	2					1	0	3	6					0	0	9	15	0	0	2	2	1	0	27	60
Business & Manage.	1	1	1	38			4	35																	1	4	23	166	3	2	13	34	5	7	41	273
Communications																									1	0	11	25					1	0	11	25
Computer & Info. Service																									0	0	0	2					0	0	0	2
Education	36	9	140	49			267	126	3	0	56	3	14	0	51	11					163	73	16	12	121	35	573	194	33	12	164	45	370	130	1267	440
Engineering							4	87																	0	1	0	30					0	1	4	117
Fine & Applied Arts							3	3																	0	1	16	4	0	0	2	0	0	1	21	7
Foreign Language							2	0																	0	0	16	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	21	1
Health Professions																	0	5	15	179					3	1	57	18	1	0	7	0	4	6	79	197
Home Economics																													6	0	25	0	6	0	25	0
Law																									1	5	48	263					1	5	48	263
Letters							11	6																	3	0	25	11	1	0	12	3	4	0	48	20
Library Science																									6	0	64	10					6	0	64	10
Mathematics							12	11																	0	1	9	7	1	0	3	1	1	1	24	19
Physical Sciences							0	7																	1	0	5	20					1	0	5	27
Psychology																									0	0	5	6	1	1	12	2	1	1	17	8
Public Affairs & Service							1	8																	9	7	52	66					9	7	53	74
Social Sciences							3	5																	0	1	25	33	0	0	3	2	0	1	31	40
TOTALS	37	10	141	87	0	0	331	393	3	0	56	5	14	0	51	11	1	5	18	185	163	73	16	12	146	57	938	671	46	15	285	89	410	160	1797	553

*Clemson did not show break-down by race.

Source: South Carolina Commission on Higher Education.

TABLE 5

ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAMS AT SOUTH CAROLINA STATE: 1976-77

PROGRAM	PROGRAM
1. Accounting	16. Library Education
2. Art Education	17. Mathematics - General
*3. Biology	18. Music Education
4. Business Management and Administration	19. Office Administration
5. Chemistry	20. Physical Education
6. Dramatic Arts	21. Physics
*7. Elementary Education	22. Political Science & Government
17 8. Engineering Technologies	23. Psychology - General
*9. English - General	*24. Rehabilitation Counseling
10. Family Relations & Child Development	*25. Secondary Education
11. Foods and Nutrition	26. Social Sciences - General
12. History	27. Sociology
*13. Home Economics Education	28. Spanish
14. Home Economics - General	29. Special Education
15. Industrial Education	*30. Speech Pathology
*31. Student Personnel	

*MASTER'S program also offered

Source: South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, Degrees Conferred By Postsecondary Institution In South Carolina.

TABLE 6
NUMBER OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES AND NUMBER ENTERING COLLEGE
NINE SOUTH CAROLINA COUNTIES, 1980-84

COUNTY	1980		1981		1982		1983		1984	
	HSG	EC	HSG	EC	HSG	EC	HSG	EC	HSG	EC
Aiken	1500	680	1490	680	1520	690	1440	650	1330	600
Bamberg	250	130	250	130	200	100	230	120	220	110
Barnwell	240	110	260	110	270	120	260	110	230	100
Berkley	1130	450	1220	480	1300	510	1200	470	1180	470
Calhoun	150	30	160	30	180	40	130	30	130	30
Clarendon	400	120	400	120	360	110	430	130	370	110
Dorchester	850	360	930	400	900	380	950	400	890	380
Lexington	2220	1090	2330	1140	2320	1140	2280	1120	2310	1130
Orangeburg	1150	510	1290	570	1310	580	1110	490	1000	440
TOTALS	7890	3480	8330	3660	8360	3670	8030	3520	7660	3370

Source: Births, Projected First Grade Enrollments, High School Graduates and Number Entering College for the State & the Counties, 1978-1984
Office of Research, Report Series, Vol. 1, No. 42
South Carolina Department of Education; Columbia, S. C., September 1978.

2. RECOMMENDATION No. 1

Mission of South Carolina State College

CCBE finds no justification for the State of South Carolina's actions in eliminating meaningful academic and professional programs at South Carolina State College over the past years. Follow-up data of the graduates of the programs in law and agriculture show that these former students are highly successful across the United States as well as in South Carolina. There is still the need to implement professional and graduate programs at this institution as the mission is broadened.

Therefore, CCBE recommends:

THAT the mission of South Carolina State College be to educate students, particularly those in the surrounding nine-county area, in the liberal arts and in a minimum of forty programs, including ten master's, two doctoral, and two professional degree programs. Further, the graduate degree programs should include specific programs of significance to the ethnic minority population in these United States, and the undergraduate and professional degree programs should concentrate on those areas where Blacks are underrepresented in the job market.

The Mission Plan Chart below illustrates CCBE's recommendation.

B. Academic Programs

In South Carolina, the issue of duplication and overlapping of academic programs in higher education has been addressed by the South Carolina Legislature and the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. However, as has been stated earlier in this report, the black institution should not be the one to lose programs to the predominantly white institution because of race. In the case of high school desegregation, traditional black schools lost names, personnel, and physical plants because of a number of unfair tactics thrust upon the black community.

Thus, CCBE reaffirms the Office of Civil Rights statement: "The elimination of such program duplication shall be carried out consistent with the objective of strengthening the traditionally black colleges."

In the fourteen Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states, data clearly shows that Blacks are not enrolled in significant numbers in selected professional and undergraduate programs. Tables 6 and 7 illustrate these facts.

Additionally, a view of where the jobs will be in 1980 and thereafter enables school administrators to objectively consider the implementation of new programs. Table 8 presents such a view.

**MISSION PLAN CHART – SOUTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE
1980–1981 TO 1984–1985**

AREA	ACTIVITIES AND GOALS				
	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
Overall Mission	4-Yr. liberal-arts, with master's pgm.	Same	Smaller doctoral granting institution; liberal arts and sciences	Same	Same
Degree Programs (certified)	32 undergraduate 9 master's	33 undergraduate 9 master's	34 undergraduate 9 master's 1 doctoral	35 undergraduate 10 master's 1 doctoral	35 undergrad. 10 master's 2 doctoral
Geographic Area Served (Recruitment Priority)	Nine surrounding counties	Nine surrounding counties and numbers from elsewhere	Same - plus out-of-state students	Same	Same - plus foreign students
Projected Enrollment	3,300	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500
Faculty	200 FTE 50% doctorates 55% masters 15% other	225 FTE 35% doctorates 55% masters 10% other	250 FTE 40% doctorates 50% masters 10% other	275 FTE 45% doctorates 50% masters 5% other	300 FTE 50% doctorate 45% masters 5% other
Academic Support Serv.	10% of Ed. & Gen.	12% of Ed. & Gen.	16% of Ed. & Gen.	18% of Ed. & Gen.	20% of Ed. & G.
Scholarships & Fellowships	10% of Ed. & Gen.	10% of Ed. & Gen.	15% of Ed. & Gen.	15% of Ed. & Gen.	15% of Ed. & G.
Research	2% of Ed. & Gen.	6% of Ed. & Gen.	10% of Ed. & Gen.	10% of Ed. & Gen.	10% of Ed. & G.
Revenue-State Appropriation \$ = Constant Dollars	72% = 9 million	74% = \$10 million	76% = \$12 million	78% = \$15 million	80% = \$ 20 million

TABLE 7

BACHELOR'S DEGREES AWARDED TO BLACK STUDENTS IN FOURTEEN STATES; PERCENTAGE IN SELECTED FIELDS, 1975-76

States	Total Bachelor's Degrees	Percent of Total Degrees in Fields						
		Biological Sciences	Business & Management	Education	Engineering	Health Profession	Public Affairs	Social Sciences
North Carolina	3,886	4.0	19.7	26.9	2.6	3.9	3.4	19.7
Louisiana	3,797	2.5	21.8	30.5	3.2	5.6	6.3	9.5
Texas	3,210	3.5	21.6	30.9	2.9	5.9	3.0	14.5
Alabama	2,573	4.7	19.5	34.2	2.4	5.7	6.4	12.8
Virginia	2,501	4.0	17.9	36.2	1.1	3.3	3.8	15.4
Georgia	2,310	4.8	19.1	24.6	2.3	3.7	3.2	20.6
Mississippi	2,105	5.0	16.1	42.1	1.6	1.6	3.0	19.0
Florida	1,959	1.9	19.3	29.4	1.3	4.5	6.3	21.8
Tennessee	1,794	6.2	17.5	25.1	2.6	2.8	6.0	19.3
Maryland	1,745	3.8	14.8	26.2	0.5	6.0	5.8	19.8
South Carolina	1,475	6.2	16.9	27.1	1.4	3.8	2.2	20.6
Arkansas	779	4.2	16.2	36.1	0.9	1.8	6.5	16.0
Kentucky	515	1.7	13.0	26.8	0.8	3.9	9.7	18.4
West Virginia	296	1.7	12.8	28.4	1.0	2.0	16.6	15.2

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Higher Education General Information Survey, Degrees & Other Formal Awards Conferred Between July 1, 1975 & June 30, 1976.

TABLE 8

FIRST PROFESSIONAL DEGREES AWARDED IN SELECTED FIELDS; IN FOURTEEN STATES: PERCENT AWARDED TO BLACK STUDENTS, 1975-76

STATES	DENTISTRY		STATES	MEDICINE		STATES	LAW	
	Total	% Black		Total	% Black		Total	% Black
* Tennessee	207	12.6	* Tennessee	384	22.7	* North Carolina	614	13.5
Maryland	122	7.4	North Carolina	327	6.4	Arkansas	175	6.3
Georgia	169	4.7	Maryland	281	4.3	Louisiana	699	6.2
Kentucky	151	2.6	Florida	311	4.2	Maryland	482	5.4
Virginia	104	1.9	Louisiana	299	4.0	Texas	1,776	5.2
Alabama	70	1.4	West Virginia	81	3.7	Florida	984	3.7
Texas	260	0	Mississippi	115	3.5	South Carolina	277	3.2
Louisiana	88	0	Georgia	283	3.2	Kentucky	444	2.7
North Carolina	83	0	Alabama	132	3.0	Georgia	522	2.5
West Virginia	52	0	Texas	715	2.8	Virginia	704	2.3
South Carolina	51	0	Virginia	268	2.6	Alabama	355	2.0
Florida	18	0	South Carolina	161	2.5	Tennessee	543	1.3
Arkansas	0	0	Kentucky	233	1.3	West Virginia	104	1.0
Mississippi	0	0	Arkansas	120	0	Mississippi	224	0.4

NOTE: * In Tennessee, Meharry Medical School, a traditionally black institution, enrolls a large percentage of Blacks in dentistry and medicine. In North Carolina, the law school at N.C. Central University at Durham, a traditionally black institution, enrolls a large percentage of Blacks in law.

Source: National Center for Education Statistics

1. Academic Programs: South Carolina State College

Among the numerous degree programs offered at the twelve senior public institutions, South Carolina State offers thirty-one, including eight master's programs, mostly in education, according to the 1976-77 report of the Commission on Higher Education. Of these 31 offerings, 12 are educational programs.

South Carolina State College is a LAND-GRANT institution, and CCBE expect funds to be allocated under the land-grant provisions of the Federal Government so that research, experiments, and other educational services may be realized to enhance the college's academic programs.

2. RECOMMENDATION No. 2 **Academic Programs**

Toward responding to both the state and national need for larger numbers of black graduates in specific areas, CCBE recommends:

THAT academic programs at South Carolina State College be increased to a minimum of forty by the 1984-85 academic year. Also recommended are the additions of adequate, highly qualified teaching personnel, academic and institutional support services, and adequate state appropriations for the full implementation of these programs.

The chart below outlines CCBE's recommendation for academic programs at South Carolina State College.

B. Student Enrollment

As indicated in Table 10, black student enrollment in the senior public institutions is substantially low; however, the numbers for Fall 1976 are significant increases over the Fall 1970 enrollment figures. But, of particular significance is the fact that Blacks received only 12.79 percent of the baccalaureate degrees awarded in the twelve senior public institutions from June 1977 to July 1978. In fact, of the 968 degrees received by Blacks, South Carolina State College awarded 525 of these. These figures represent two academic years! Table 3 shows the number of graduates from each of the twelve institutions.

Three major factors contribute to low enrollment and retention of black students in senior public institutions: admissions policies, lack of sufficient financial support programs, and lack of meaningful developmental programs.

Myths and misconceptions abound on the ideas of student competence. Yet, numerous studies have pointed out that those who hold to the myths and misconceptions "ardently believe that the modern university is still what it was in ancient and medieval times with the curriculum being the trivium or quadrivium." But, today, the public college

ACADEMIC PROGRAM PLAN CHART - SOUTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE: 1980-81 TO 1984-85

AREA	ACTIVITIES AND GOALS				
	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
Programs	Add two new pgms. 1) M. S. - Finance & Banking 2) B. S. - Nursing	Add one new pgm. 3) B.S.-Engineering (electrical or petro. or nuclear)	Add two new pgms. 4) Ed. D. - Educ. Adm. 5) B. A. - Urban Planning	Add two new pgms. 6) M.A.-Foods Management 7) B.A.-Computer Science	Add two new pgms. 8) Ph. D. - Speech Pathology 9) M. S. - Economics
Entering Students (majors)	1) 15 2) 20	3) 15	4) 10 5) 25	6) 15 7) 20	8) 10 9) 15
Support Services (Recruitment & Records Maintenance) \$ = Constant Dollars	\$ 30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000	\$80,000

TABLE 9

BLACK/WHITE ENROLLMENT BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION IN FOURTEEN STATES, FALL 1976

STATES	PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR			PUBLIC TWO-YEAR			PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR			PRIVATE TWO-YEAR		
	Black	White	% Black	Black	White	% Black	Black	White	% Black	Black	White	% Black
Texas	27,735	250,926	8.6	25,360	150,566	11.5	7,541	61,738	10.0	411	1,061	24.9
Louisiana	27,197	86,005	23.2	4,840	9,826	31.6	3,906	16,466	17.9	0	0	0
North Carolina	20,095	86,216	18.4	17,778	67,522	20.5	8,350	35,876	18.5	1,169	6,078	15.7
Maryland	19,197	74,907	19.0	15,265	61,358	19.1	1,475	23,625	5.5	1,022	545	63.8
Virginia	17,665	107,817	13.8	12,207	71,968	14.1	5,483	22,509	19.2	486	769	36.5
Mississippi	17,509	35,765	32.2	8,251	22,149	25.2	2,504	6,404	27.7	1,103	349	75.0
Alabama	15,174	79,114	15.8	8,085	31,905	19.9	8,845	7,486	52.9	897	1,625	35.3
Georgia	14,946	81,331	15.1	6,666	31,851	17.0	8,945	18,056	32.1	408	2,830	12.4
Tennessee	13,165	90,871	12.3	6,798	25,850	20.6	6,110	32,778	15.3	356	1,354	20.4
Florida	11,193	93,972	10.0	21,879	134,196	12.7	6,815	47,357	11.2	11	565	1.9
South Carolina	8,709	52,763	14.0	9,853	23,496	29.3	6,129	11,704	34.0	725	2,534	22.0
Arkansas	7,374	41,057	14.9	1,270	7,133	14.7	1,312	6,922	15.5	225	516	29.6
Kentucky	6,173	81,957	6.9	2,300	14,102	13.7	660	15,970	3.9	431	2,390	13.9
West Virginia	2,713	52,465	4.8	287	12,090	2.3	337	8,561	3.7	140	1,477	8.6

Source: SREB, Black Enrollment in Higher Education: Trends in the Nation and the South, 1978

TABLE 10
BLACK ENROLLMENT PERCENTAGE AT SOUTH CAROLINA'S SENIOR
PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
FALL 1977

Institution	Total Student Head Count	% Black
University of South Carolina	22,151	10
Clemson University	11,115	3
College of Charleston	5,193	6
Winthrop	4,481	16
South Carolina State	3,897	93
Citadel	3,358	8
Francis Marion	2,659	16
Medical University of S.C.	2,404	4
USC - Spartanburg	2,189	9
Lander	1,698	16
USC - Aiken	1,539	14
USC - Coastal Carolina	1,524	8
TOTAL HEAD COUNT:	62,208	

Source: S. C. Commission on Higher Education, Annual Report, 1979.

or university must not serve exclusively aristocratic and meritocratic ideals. Further, aptitude and achievement tests used for admissions purposes are detrimental to the life goals of black students. A significant study conducted at Brown University (Success and Admission Criteria for Potentially Successful Risks) concluded that "standard achievement and aptitude tests tell us very little about posteducational success." And intelligence tests tell even less. As one educator puts it, "admissions policies should emphasize description and prescription, not prediction and exclusion."

Black students find it difficult to work on full-time jobs and simultaneously pursue academic studies. With many of them coming from families who fall at or below the poverty levels, it is evident that these students need financial support programs as well as meaningful counseling programs.

CCBE believes that senior public institutions should increase their scholarship and fellowship allocations for black students at both the graduate and undergraduate levels; should seek federal funds for student financial-aid, research stipends, and assistantships; and should assist eligible black students in using state tuition grants. Tables 11, 12, and 13 illustrate sources of financial help and of student required fees at public institutions in South Carolina.

Also needed for black students is the proper dissemination of information on financial-aid before these students graduate from high school. Thus, the recruitment programs need sensitive personnel and adequate funds to carry out meaningful programs to increase the black student population in the senior public institutions of South Carolina, with emphasis on pool building.

The Carnegie Commission recommended that higher educational institutions implement meaningful developmental programs, taking students from where they are academically to levels where the institutions can proceed to teach them the mastery of skills and principles of knowledge. (See The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education 1972 report.) This means that such programs are to be culturally diverse as well as remedial.

Further, students who attend predominantly white institutions are mandated to "suffer" through course after course that denies the existence of black people or of the non-western world. To question such practices often means to flunk a course or to be marked for failure or dismissal from a program, according to student reports received by CCBE. Such inhumane burdens should not (must not) be placed upon the shoulders of black students, CCBE believes.

Counselors are greatly responsible for the low retention rates of black students in predominantly white institutions. Counselors at these schools often do not understand, or care to understand, the peculiar circumstances of black students. This is one reason why many academic programs at senior public institutions need re-examining and re-designing so as to train counselors, teachers, and administrators for schools in the 1980s, 1990s and the year 2000. CCBE also realizes that counseling and placement services are areas that continue to require significant funding at South Carolina State College.

TABLE 11

FEDERAL AND STATE FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS, FOUR STATES

STATES	Federal Programs, Amounts Allotted				State Program	
	National Direct Student Loans	Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant	College Work Study Program	Basic Educational Opportunity Grant	State Aid Programs To Students Dollars Spent	
	1977-78	1977-78	1977-78	1976-77	1976-77	1977-78
South Carolina	\$2,013,792	\$1,149,301	\$5,944,485	\$28,074,000 Rec. 22,864,000 Used	\$7,716,000	\$8,948,000
North Carolina	7,255,328	3,060,029	9,942,960	51,637,000 Rec. 40,029,000 Used	1,571,000	2,580,000
Georgia	4,127,635	1,255,717	8,602,839	37,047,000 Rec. 28,122,000 Used	1,781,000	2,807,000
Mississippi	3,313,707	1,590,764	6,347,801	36,581,000 Rec. 29,585,000 Used	711,000	1,044,000

Source: Southern Regional Education Board, FACT Book on Higher Education in The South: 1977 & 1978.

TABLE 12

FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS TO UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES BY AGENCY IN FOURTEEN STATES, 1974-75
(\$000's)

STATES	TOTAL	NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION	DEPARTMENT			OTHER
			HEW	DEFENSE	AGRICULTURE	
Texas	\$217,861	\$13,691	\$154,860	\$13,984	\$14,858	\$20,468
North Carolina	132,289	7,163	102,639	2,004	13,126	7,357
Maryland	109,887	9,160	83,280	3,082	4,365	10,000
Florida	100,709	12,478	69,941	4,862	6,379	7,069
Tennessee	89,966	3,333	71,348	1,265	9,443	4,577
Alabama	82,808	2,531	66,732	1,029	9,854	2,662
Georgia	80,961	5,320	54,616	5,887	9,759	5,379
Virginia	70,459	4,587	48,614	1,567	8,624	7,067
Louisiana	53,403	1,832	40,518	1,063	6,822	1,168
Mississippi	47,549	1,507	34,820	339	9,117	1,766
Kentucky	44,413	1,431	31,677	448	9,965	892
South Carolina	41,196	1,672	29,779	296	7,342	2,107
Arkansas	29,671	972	20,942	113	7,057	587
West Virginia	23,041	502	16,235	125	4,341	1,838

Source: National Science Foundation, Federal Support To Universities, Colleges and Selected Non-Profit Institutions, Fiscal Year 1975, Appendix B, 1977.

TABLE 13

TUITION AND FEES, UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS, SOUTH CAROLINA
SENIOR PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1977-78

Institutions	S. C. Students	Out-of-State Students
1. Clemson	\$ 830	\$ 1,780
2. Winthrop College	815	1,515
3. Citadel	790	1,650
4. Univ. of South Carolina	732	1,692
5. Medical University	660	1,320
6. S. C. State	600	1,300
7. Lander	560	1,210
8. College of Charleston	550	1,450
9. Francis Marion	460	960

Source: South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, Annual Report, 1979.

According to the National Planning Association's Regional Projection Series, 1977, the population figures for South Carolina's residents, age 15-34 years, will be 1,032,000 in 1980; 1,000,000 in 1985, and 970,000 in 1990.

In 1976, South Carolina senior public institutions enrolled 8,709 black students, representing 14 percent of the total enrollment. The two-year public institutions enrolled 9,853 in the same year, representing 29.3 percent of the total enrollment.

In 1977, South Carolina senior public institutions enrolled 8,274 black students, representing 12 percent of the enrollment. The two-year public institutions enrolled 10,756 black students in the same year, representing 30 percent of the total enrollment.

Therefore, black enrollment is decreasing in the public senior institutions and increasing in the two-year public institutions. CCBE objects to this posture in black student enrollment, for it continues to assert that the college degree is the "ticket" to economic, social, and cultural advantages in American society. Of significance is the statement of The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education: "The small size of the black professional class is the greatest single handicap the black community faces in its efforts to raise standards of living, production, consumption, and education." Further the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) reports that "job search will be easier for Blacks who earn degrees in fields where openings exceed the number of graduates, fields traditionally closed to Blacks—engineering, accounting, computer science, health professions, urban and regional planning, communications, . . ." And in the 1979 final report of the Fifty-Sixth American Assembly, entitled The Integrity of Higher Education, a statement reaffirms CCBE's position: "The public correctly or incorrectly believes that there is waste in its universities; . . . they find too few minority students in programs which give access to the professions and prepare for influential roles in the total society; they fear that affirmative action is only a promissory note with no appreciable advance for minorities and women within the academy itself."

1. Black Student Enrollment: South Carolina's Twelve Senior Public Institutions

According to the United States CENSUS, 1970, in South Carolina 272,000 Blacks, age 5-17, were residents of the State. In 1980, these youths will be age 15-27. Thus, CCBE's plan for black student enrollment in the senior public institutions calls for percentage increases across each institution from the 1977 full-time graduate and undergraduate black enrollment of 360 and 6,064, respectively.

2. RECOMMENDATION No. 3 Black Enrollment at South Carolina's Senior Public Institutions

The Fall 1977 black enrollment in South Carolina's twelve senior public institutions was 14 percent. This is substantially lower than the 31 percent black population figure in South Carolina. Further, in many professional and graduate programs, as well as in specific undergraduate programs, no black students were enrolled in 1977.

Therefore, CCBE recommends:

THAT, by 1980-81, black, full-time enrollment at each of the twelve senior public institutions in South Carolina increase substantially across each institution and that each institution increase black full-time enrollment in specified undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs.

The chart below illustrates CCBE's plan on black student enrollment over the next five years in the twelve senior public institutions in South Carolina.

D. Faculty, Administrative Staffs, Non-Academic Personnel, and Governing Boards

1. Faculty

According to the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) report, Racial Composition of Faculties in Public Colleges and Universities of the South: "Black representation on college faculties in the public institutions in the South continues to be low relative to the share Blacks constitute of the total population, or of college enrollments No more than 8 percent of total faculty in public institutions of the region are Black. Blacks account for 18.8 percent of the South's population and 15.1 percent of total collegiate enrollment in the region."

In South Carolina, as of October 1977, only 73 Blacks were employed as full-time teaching faculty at the white senior public institutions, while South Carolina State, the black institution, employed 172 black faculty. Further, no white institution employed more than 6 percent black faculty, while black enrollment in the system was 14 percent, and the black population in South Carolina was 31 percent. Table 14 shows the number of faculty by rank, race, and sex at the nine senior public institutions as of 1978-79 in South Carolina.

The often-made argument by college and university officials about the hiring of black faculty and administrators is that few, if any, black professionals are available for employment. CCBE believes that this excuse shall continue unless many of these same institutions enroll black students in master's and doctoral programs. Additionally, until the pool of black professionals is enlarged, colleges and universities shall have to pay highly competitive salaries to qualified Blacks. On the other hand, CCBE believes that black faculty members at the twelve public institutions are paid salaries considerably lower than their white counterparts.

BLACK FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT PLAN CHART: SOUTH CAROLINA SENIOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS: 1980-81 TO 1984-85

Institution and Black Enrollment/Percentage of Total Enrollment	1980-81			1981-82			1982-83			1983-84			1984-85		
	Increase			Increase			Increase			Increase			Increase		
	No.	%	PC	No.	%	PC	No.	%	PC	No.	%	PC	No.	%	PC
CLEMSON U = 143 (2%)	179	25	Architecture Engineering Building Constr. Agriculture	224	25	Same	260	25	Same	325	25	Same	406	25	Same
G = 29	37	25		46	25	Same	58	25	Same	73	25	Ph. D- Ec.	91	25	Same
C. of CHARLESTON U = 179 (5%)	224	25	Marine Bio. Geology Spanish Elementary Ed. Marine Biology	260	25	Same	325	25	Same	406	25	Same	508	25	Same
G = 1	2	100		4	100	Same	8	100	Same	16	100	Same	32	100	Same
FRANCIS MARION U = 207 (12%)	259	25	Mathematics Psychology Elem. Educ.	324	25	Same	405	25	Same	506	25	Same	633	25	Same
G = 0	2	100		4	100	Same	8	100	Same	16	100	Same	32	100	Same
LANDER U = 224 (16%)	260	25	Accounting Early Childhood E. Medical Lab. Tech.	325	25	Same	406	25	Same	508	25	Same	635	25	Same
G = N/A															
MEDICAL UNIV. U = 59 (5%)	74	25	Phy. Therapy Radiologic Tech. Medicine Dentistry	93	25	Same	116	25	Same	145	25	Same	181	25	Same
G/1st Prof. = 36	45	25		56	25	Same	70	25	Same	88	25	Same	110	25	Same

(Continued on next page)

BLACK FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT PLAN CHART: SOUTH CAROLINA SENIOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS: 1980-81 TO 1984-85 (Continued)

Institution and Black Enrollment/Percentage of Total Enrollment	1980-81 Increase			1981-82 Increase			1982-83 Increase			1983-84 Increase			1984-85 Increase		
	No.	%	PC	No.	%	PC	No.	%	PC	No.	%	PC	No.	%	PC
SOUTH CAROLINA STATE U = 2967 (93%)	3115	5	Nursing Reg. Phy. Sciences Library Science and Info.	3271	5	Same & Acct. Engr. Sp. Ed.	3435	5	Same & Ur. Plg.	3607	5	Same & Comp. Sc.	3787	5	Same
G = 142	156	10	Fin. & Banking Speech Pathology Rehab. Counseling	172	10	Same & Student Pers.	189	10	Same & Ed. D. in Ed. Adm.	208	10	Same & Food & Nutrition	229	10	Same & Econ. & Ph. D. in Speech P.
THE CITADEL U = 76 (4%) G = 0	95	25	Civil Eng. Reading	119	25	Same	149	25	Same	186	25	Same	233	25	Same
	25	100		31	25	Same	38	25	Same	48	25	Same	60	25	Same
UNIVERSITY OF S. C. (Main) U = 1396 (10%)	1745	25	Advertising Latin Am. Studies Sciences	2181	25	Same & Marktg.	2726	25	Same & Acctg.	2862	25	Same	3578	25	Same
G/1st Prof. = 148	185	25	Medicine Law Public Health Adm. Pharmacy Criminal Justice	231	25	Same & Intl. Bus. Comm. Ph. D. Stu. Pers.	289	25	Same & Ph. D. in Math. Elem. E. Sec. Ed.	361	25	Same & Ph. D. in Reading Chem. Eg.	451	25	Same & Ph. D. in Sch. Pay. Spec. Ed.
USC-AIKEN U = 157 (15%) G = N/A	196	25	Biology Early Childhood E.	245	25	Same	306	25	Same	383	25	Same	479	25	Same

(Continued on next page)

BLACK FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT PLAN CHART: SOUTH CAROLINA SENIOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS: 1980-81 TO 1984-85 (Continued)

Institution and Black Enrollment/Percentage of Total Enrollment	1980-81			1981-82			1982-83			1983-84			1984-85		
	Increase			Increase			Increase			Increase			Increase		
	No.	%	PC	No.	%	PC	No.	%	PC	No.	%	PC	No.	%	PC
USC-COASTAL U = 99 (8%)	124	25	Marine Biology Mathematics	155	25	Same	194	25	Same	243	25	Same	304	25	Same
G = N/A															
USC-SPARTANBURG U = 92 (7%)	115	25	Physical Sciences Early Childhood Ed.	144	25	Same	180	25	Same	225	25	Same	281	25	Same
G = N/A															
WINTHROP U = 465 (15%)	581	25	Consumer Econ. Distributive Educ.	726	25	Same & Asian A - Stud.	908	25	Same	1134	25	Same	1418	25	Same
G = 4	5	25	Library Science Reading	6	25	Same	8	25	Same	10	25	Same	13	25	Same

Note: U - Undergraduates
G - Graduates
PC - Program Concentration (While Black students major in other areas, these areas are critical to career opportunities.)
N/A - No Program Offered

TABLE 14

BLACK/WHITE FACULTY BY RANK AT SENIOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS IN SOUTH CAROLINA: 1978-79

INSTITUTIONS	DEANS/ASSISTANT DEANS				PROFESSORS				ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS				ASSISTANT PROFESSOR			
	BLACK		WHITE		BLACK		WHITE		BLACK		WHITE		BLACK		WHITE	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Citadel			3				37				61	1			60	1
Clemson	1		77	7			209	5	3		259	18	3	3	176	51
College of Charleston	1	2	41	4			12	5			47	7	1	3	57	17
Francis Marion			1				15				23	2	1	1	17	9
Lander			1				9	2	1		22	8		1	15	14
Medical University	1		14	5			125	9	1		110	32		1	133	44
S. C. State	4	2			25	10	5	1	18	15	14	2	35	20	16	2
USC			15	2			265	15	4	2	377	69	7	6	363	175
Winthrop			35	17			31	7			26	7	2		35	37
TOTALS	7	4	187	35	25	10	708	44	27	17	939	146	49	35	872	350

Source: South Carolina Human Affairs Commission

TABLE 14-Continued

INSTITUTIONS	INSTRUCTORS				LECTURERS				OTHER FACULTY				TOTALS			
	BLACK		WHITE		BLACK		WHITE		BLACK		WHITE		BLACK		WHITE	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Citadel			3										0	0	164	2
Clemson	1	1	64	51						1	11	21	8	5	796	151
College of Charleston										3	6	10	2	8	163	43
Francis Marion	2	1	14	10									3	2	70	21
Lander			4	3				1	1	1	51	28	2	2	101	56
Medical University	1		33	41					1	1	38	27	4	2	453	158
S. C. State	19	33	6	1					3	19		1	104	99	41	7
USC	6	8	76	109	5	5	41	38					22	21	1167	408
Winthrop	1	1	14	18				1		1	7	13	3	2	148	100
TOTALS	30	44	214	233	5	5	41	40	5	26	113	100	148	141	3,103	948

Dr. James E. Blackwell, eminent sociologist, states in his publication, The Participation of Blacks in Graduate and Professional Schools: An Assessment, 1977, that:

The problem of hiring of black faculty is related to both the available pool of black faculty and to reluctance and refusal by some institutions to hire full-time black faculty for graduate and professional schools. Moreover, there is ample evidence that black faculty, when hired, are recruited at the lowest levels and then expected to engage in essentially non-academic types of responsibilities (e.g., counseling all black students and serving on all committees dealing with minorities) which may reduce the time available for those scholarly activities which, inevitably, are more heavily weighted for tenure decisions. Further, there is a reluctance of non-black medical schools to hire black faculty for positions in the basic sciences and as administrators in the medical schools. At most of the medical schools throughout the United States, the majority of black faculty who have been hired, if at all, hold part-time clinical appointments.

Black faculty are also often placed in a position of having to defend the process of black students in medical and dental schools as well as in graduate schools and to monitor the progression process of these students in order to minimize blatant and subtle forms of discrimination against black students. All of these issues, in addition to those of social and personal interaction with unfriendly non-black faculty, can be serious problems for black faculty in the predominantly white graduate and professional schools (pp. 80-81).

Table 15 shows average salaries for full-time equivalent teaching faculty at the twelve senior public institutions in South Carolina. Evident in this table is the fact that the majority of institutions rank below the average salary across all faculty ranks of the SREB states. Also of significance is the fact that South Carolina State College ranks below the SREB average across all faculty ranks—professor, associate professor, assistant professor and instructor.

As stated in the 1978 report of Howard University's Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education, p. 24:

The historical perspective on Black education has significant relevance for affirmative action today. First, Blacks were denied opportunities to gain an education; when it was reluctantly offered, education was restricted to a type that was considered suitable for their second-class position. The result was a deliberate policy of educational exclusion which limited the number of qualified Blacks for positions in higher education and erected artificial barriers to exclude those who were highly qualified.

At a minimum, affirmative action is necessary not only to rectify past injuries, but also to compensate for this policy of exclusion. While white women and a few minority groups are now able to take advantage of affirmative action efforts because of the availability of supply, the situation remains critical for Blacks. If affirmative action in faculty employment is to be successful for Blacks, it must be tied to affirmative action for students. This situation makes the plight of Blacks all the more serious and the need for comprehensive affirmative action even more critical than for other groups.

TABLE 15

AVERAGE SALARIES: FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT TEACHING FACULTY, SOUTH CAROLINA SENIOR PUBLIC COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES, FALL 1977
(9 Month Basis)

Institution	Rank: Instructor	Institution	Rank: Asst. Professor	Institution	Rank: Assoc. Professor	Institution	Rank: Professor
Medical Univ.	\$13,103	Medical Univ.	\$18,295	Medical Univ.	\$22,061	Medical Univ.	\$26,079
Citadel	13,037	Univ. of S.C.	15,763	Univ. of S.C.	19,536	Univ. of S.C.	25,500
Clemson	12,346	Citadel	15,862	Clemson	19,384	Clemson	24,324
Winthrop	12,297	Clemson	15,390	Citadel	18,691	Citadel	22,992
Univ. of S.C.	12,273	Winthrop	15,346	Winthrop	18,346	Winthrop	22,314
College of Charleston	11,934	College of Charleston	15,134	College of Charleston	17,154	Francis Marion	21,975
USC-Spartanburg	11,685	Francis Marion	14,521	Francis Marion	16,910	College of Charleston	19,832
USC - Coastal	11,632	Lander	14,303	S.C. State	16,449	Lander	19,497
USC - Aiken	11,600	S.C. State	14,051	Lander	16,406	S.C. State	19,356
Lander	11,402	USC-Coastal	13,747	USC - Spartanburg	16,136	USC-Coastal	18,124
S.C. State	11,341	USC-Spartanburg	13,702	USC-Aiken	15,521	USC - Spartanburg	17,816
Francis Marion	10,783	USC-Aiken	12,857	USC-Coastal	15,187	USC-Aiken	15,325
Average Salary in SREB States 4-yr. Inst.	\$12,391		\$15,003		\$17,759		\$21,391
Universities	\$12,536		\$16,070		\$19,544		\$25,491

Sources: CHE, Annual Report, 1979, and Southern Regional Education Board, Fact Book on Higher Education In The South: 1977 & 1978.

2. RECOMMENDATION No. 4

Black Faculty

Therefore, CCBE recommends:

THAT by 1980-81, each of the twelve senior public institutions in South Carolina desegregate its faculty in the appropriate disciplines according to the proportion of black students graduating with master's degrees in those disciplines.

The chart below illustrates CCBE's recommendation for the desegregation of faculty at each of the twelve senior public institutions. However, it should be noted here that the CRITERIA (see Appendix C) is weak. CCBE raises the question about the validity of the standard for determining the percentage of black faculty. Until black student enrollment is increased significantly at the graduate level, the criterion used in this recommendation is questionable.

3. Non-Academic Personnel

In Fall 1976, 1,590 Blacks were enrolled in graduate programs in South Carolina, representing 12.9 percent of the total graduate enrollment. This means that by 1980, at least 1,590 Blacks shall be available in the labor market area in the state, given increases of Blacks receiving graduate degrees since 1976. Of this number, CCBE views the 12.9 percent as a valid minimum proportion of Blacks for key, decision-making positions in each of the non-academic job categories at each of the senior public institutions.

The non-academic areas of concern in this report are:

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| 1. Recruitment | 7. Business Services |
| 2. Financial Aid | 8. Buildings & Grounds |
| 3. Admissions | 9. Student Personnel |
| 4. Counseling | 10. Athletics |
| 5. Placement | 11. Printing & Publishing |
| 6. Auxiliary Services | 12. Temporary Systems
(i.e. international centers,
women's centers, cultural centers) |
| | 13. Public Service |

**BLACK FACULTY FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT PLAN: SOUTH CAROLINA'S
SENIOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS, BEGINNING 1980-81**

Discipline	Number of Master's Degrees Awarded Blacks, June 1977, South Carolina	Percent of Total Degrees Awarded Blacks	Minimum Blacks To Be Hired Per Inst.
Biological Sciences	1	.18%	1
Business & Management	12	2.11%	3
Communications	1	.18%	1
Education	500	87.72%	10
Engineering	1	.18%	1
Fine & Applied Arts	1	.18%	1
Health Professions	10	1.75%	2
Home Economics	6	1.05%	2
Letters	4	.70%	1
Library Science	6	1.05%	2
Mathematics	1	.18%	1
Physical Sciences	3	.53%	1
Psychology	2	.35%	1
Public Affairs & Services	16	2.81%	3
Social Sciences	1	.18%	1
Total Master's Degrees	570		

4. RECOMMENDATION No. 5: Black Non-Academic Personnel

In light of the above discussion, CCBE recommends:

THAT 12.9 percent of the personnel in the above thirteen non-academic areas (and others that may not be listed above) be Black and that they be hired as key managerial personnel. (Secretaries, phone operators, receptionists, maids, janitors, etc. are not included in the 12.9 percent.)

5. Governing Boards

The composition of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education and its forerunner, the State Advisory Commission on Higher Education, from 1965 to 1979, is outlined in Appendix Q. Of the forty-two appointees since 1965, only five are Black and only one of these five is female.

The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education was established in 1967 by the State General Assembly as the agency of State Government specializing in higher education.

The functions of the Commission are determined by the General Assembly, and, as stated in the 1979 Annual Report of the Commission, include the following:

1. To develop and maintain a master plan for higher education in South Carolina.
2. To make studies regarding roles, operations, structure, and external relations of South Carolina institutions of higher education.
3. To submit recommendations as may be desirable to the Budget and Control Board and General Assembly regarding policies, programs, curricula, facilities, administration and financing of the state-supported institutions of higher education.
4. To receive and review the annual appropriation requests of the state-supported institutions of higher education and submit recommendations to the Budget and Control Board and the General Assembly. Capital budgets also are reviewed by the Commission.
5. To approve new programs before they are undertaken by any state-supported institution of higher education unless approved by the General Assembly, and to review existing programs.
6. To administer certain federal programs authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, including Community Service and Continuing Education under Title I, Equipment for Undergraduate Instruction under Title VI, and Construction of Undergraduate Facilities under Title VII.

The following descriptions of Boards of Trustees are taken from the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education's publication, Legal Documents Pertaining to Postsecondary Education, March 1979.

The State College Board of Trustees was established by the General Assembly July 1, 1970. It is the governing body of Francis Marion College and other four-year state-supported colleges established after 1970. This act also includes the College of Charleston and Lander College, previous private colleges.

The Board shall be composed of one member for the each judicial circuit in the state, initially appointed by the Governor upon the advice and consent of the Senate and thereafter to be elected by the general vote of the General Assembly as hereinafter provided.

Members of The State College Board of Trustees — 1979

Name	Race
1. Allard A. Allston	Black
2. Caroline M. Beaver	White
3. Joe E. Berry, Jr.	White
4. D. Don Caughman	White
5. Edward S. Ervin, III	White
6. Peter D. Hynan	White
7. John E. Johnston, Jr.	White
8. F. Mitchell Johnson	White
9. Calhoun Lemon	White
10. Sara V. Liverance	White
11. Fitz-John C. McMaster	White
12. Alex M. Quattlebaum	White
13. Eleanora R. Richardson	White
14. John M. Trask	White
15. J. I. Washington, III	Black
16. Ellen C. Watson	Black

The University of South Carolina Board of Trustees shall be composed of the Governor of the State, the State Superintendent of Education, and the chairman of the committees on education of the Senate and House of Representatives, which four shall be members ex officio of the board, and fourteen other members, one from each judicial circuit in this state, to be elected by the general vote of the General Assembly as hereinafter provided.

**Members of the Board of Trustees of The University of
South Carolina – 1979**

Name	Race
1. John G. Beasley	White
2. T. Luke Benson	White
3. William N. Bowen	White
4. William S. Brockington	White
5. Harry A. Chapman	White
6. James W. Cothran	White
7. R. Markley Dennis, Sr.	White
8. Paul S. Goldsmith	White
9. William B. Hawkins	White
10. Dan S. Henderson	White
11. J. Robert Peters, Jr.	White
12. Honorable Richard W. Riley-Governor	White
13. Eugene C. Stoddard	White
14. Frampton W. Toole, Jr.	White
15. Hugh H. Wells	White
16. William E. Whitney, Jr.	White
17. Othniel H. Wienges, Jr.	White
18. High L. Willcox	White
19. Charles G. Williams-State Supt. of Education	White
20. D. Glenn Yarborough	White

Clemson University Board of Trustees is composed of the seven members nominated by the Will of Thomas G. Clemson (died 1888) and their successors and six members to be elected by the General Assembly in joint assembly. Three of the original trustees having been elected for a term of two years and three for a term of four years from the commencement of their terms and until their successors were elected, thereafter the General Assembly has and hereafter it shall every two years elect in joint assembly three trustees for such university who shall serve for a term of four years and until their successors shall be elected and shall qualify.

**Members of the Board of Trustees of Clemson University
1979**

Name	Race
1. Robert R. Coker	White
2. T. Kenneth Cribb	White
3. W. Green Deschamps, Jr.	White
4. William N. Geiger, Jr.	White
5. Lewis F. Holmes	White
6. Paul W. McAlister	White
7. W. Gordon McCabe, Jr.	White

Clemson University – Continued

Name	Race
8. Thomas B. McTeer, Jr.	White
9. Buck Mickel	White
10. Paul Quattlebaum, Jr.	White
11. James C. Self	White
12. D. Leslie Tindal	White
13. James M. Waddell, Jr.	White

At the Medical University of South Carolina, the management and control of the university shall be vested in a board of trustees, to be composed as follows: The Governor, the chairman of the committee on medical affairs of the Senate, the chairman of the committee on military, municipal and public affairs of the House of Representatives, ex officio, and twelve members to be elected by the General Assembly in joint assembly.

Members of The Board of Trustees of The Medical University of South Carolina – 1979

Name	Race
1. Stanley C. Baker, Jr.	White
2. Melvyn Berlinsky	White
3. Walter B. Brown	White
4. William K. Cox	White
5. William C. Draffin	White
6. Charles B. Hanna	White
7. Neill W. MacCaulay	White
8. E. Conyers O'Bryan	White
9. Harrison L. Peeples	White
10. John M. Pratt	White
11. John L. Pressly	White
12. Leon J. Rampey	White
13. Honorable Richard W. Riley-Governor	White
14. Hyman Rubin	White
15. June O. Yarborough	White

The Board of Visitors of The Citadel, the Military College of South Carolina, shall be composed of the Governor, the Adjutant General, the State Superintendent of Education and the chairmen of the military committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, who shall be members ex officio of said board, and ten others who shall be graduates of said college, seven of whom are to be elected by joint vote of the General Assembly as hereinafter provided and three of whom are to be elected by such means and methods as may be determined by the Association of Citadel Men or any succeeding organization of Citadel men; the result of the election to be certified by the president of the association to the Secretary of State.

Members of The Board of Visitors of The Citadel – 1979

Name	Race
1. Jack W. Chandler, Jr.	White
2. James L. Dodson	White
3. Leonard C. Fulghum, Jr.	White
4. B. L. Hendricks, Jr.	White
5. J. M. J. Holliday	White
6. George C. James	White
7. Larkin H. Jennings, Jr.	White
8. Charles A. Laffitte, Jr.	White
9. E. Eston Marchant	White
10. Lucas C. Padgett	White
11. E. A. Pollock	White
12. William F. Prioleau, Jr.	White
13. Honorable Richard W. Riley-Governor	White
14. William R. Risher	White
15. Thomas C. Vandiver	White
16. Thomas Dewey Wise	White

South Carolina State College shall be under the management and control of a board of trustees, composed of nine members, eight of whom shall be elected by the General Assembly, whose term of office shall be six years, the first six elected having been elected for terms of two, four and six years, so that two of them go out of office every two years. One of the elected members shall be an alumnus of the South Carolina State College. The Governor of the State shall be ex officio the ninth member of the board of trustees.

Members of The Board of Trustees of South Carolina State College – 1979

Name	Race
1. Samuel S. Bacote	Black
2. William R. Barnhart	White
3. James Boykin	Black
4. Elliott F. Elam	White
5. Marion W. Jamison, Jr.	Black
6. Honorable Richard W. Riley-Governor	White
7. Joseph D. Sapp	White
8. I. P. Stanback	Black
9. Esther H. Tecklenburg	White

The Board of Trustees of Winthrop College shall be composed of the Governor, the State Superintendent of Education and the chairmen of the committees on education of the Senate and House of Representatives who shall be members ex officio of said board, seven other members each to be elected by the joint vote of the General Assembly, as hereinafter provided, and two graduates of Winthrop College to be appointed by the Winthrop College Alumni Association or its successors, as hereinafter provided.

Members of The Board of Trustees of Winthrop College – 1979

Name	Race
1. Dorothy McCown Blackwell	White
2. Danny M. Bruce	White
3. Howard L. Burns	White
4. Charles Bussey	White
5. Jon C. Hayes	White
6. Legare Hamilton (Mrs.)	White
7. E. Darrell Jervey, II (Mrs.)	White
8. Robert C. Lake	White
9. Jim McElveen (Mrs.)	White
10. Honorable Richard W. Riley-Governor	White
11. John T. Roddey	White
12. Robert V. Royall	White
13. Ross A. Webb	White
14. F. Merritt Wilkerson	White
15. Charles G. Williams, State Supt. of Education	White

**6. RECOMMENDATION NO. 6:
Governing Boards**

According to the United States Census, 1970, Blacks in South Carolina represent 31 percent of the total population. Toward equitable Black representation on governing boards of ALL tax-supported public postsecondary institutions in South Carolina, CCBE recommends:

THAT 31 percent of ALL members of ALL governing boards, commissions, etc. of state-supported postsecondary institutions in South Carolina be Black. Further, CCBE recommends that such members be very knowledgeable about the circumstances of Blacks in the state, about the history of Blacks and education in the state, about postsecondary education in the state, and be particularly sensitive to the needs and aspirations of the black citizens of South Carolina.

The chart below illustrates CCBE's recommendation for only seven boards, representing only the twelve senior public institutions, and for the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education.

**PLAN CHART FOR BOARDS OF TRUSTEES/VISITORS AND
COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION IN
SOUTH CAROLINA 1980 - 1981**

BOARDS/COMMISSION	Present Board/Commission Composition		CCBE's Minimum Number of Blacks (31%) Recommended
	White	Black	
1. Board of Trustees Clemson University	13	0	4
2. Board of Trustees Medical University of South Carolina	15	0	5
3. Board of Trustees South Carolina State College	5	4	6*
4. Board of Trustees State College Board	13	3	5
5. Board of Visitors The Citadel	15	0	5
6. Board of Trustees University of South Carolina	18	0	6
7. Board of Trustees Winthrop College	13	0	4

8. Commission South Carolina Commission on Higher Education	12	4	5

NOTE: There are 16 judicial circuits in South Carolina.

*For South Carolina State College, CCBE recommends that 70 percent of the Trustee Board be Black since the white institutions shall carry a 70 percent white and 30 percent Black ratio on their boards, as recommended.

V. THE SURVEY

On March 5, 1979, CCBE mailed a questionnaire to selected black citizens across South Carolina and to a select number of South Carolinians living outside the state. The recipients represented education, business, law, medicine, religion, and science. Also among the group was a graduate student and a lay person.

Of the total number mailed, 46 percent questionnaires was returned. However, instead of mailing the questionnaire a second time, CCBE decided to analyze the responses from those returned and to include the responses as percentages in this Report No. 3.

For Item No. 5, "What is your present position," the responses included the following positions: (Not all positions are listed here.)

Scientist	Youth coordinator for Title III
College president	Director of student affairs
College dean of education	Education consultant
Attorney	College vice president
Counselor	Research associate
Health care administrator	College teacher
Foundation officer	Coordinator of federal programs
High school principal	Medical doctor
Owner of business	Insurance agent
Graduate student	

The questionnaire and responses in percentages are outlined below:

QUESTIONNAIRE ON OPINIONS AND CONCERNS OF POSTSECONDARY
EDUCATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA

In the following pages which follow, you will find questions or items related to concerns, opinions, problems, and suggestions about postsecondary education and its relationship to Blacks in South Carolina. Please respond to each item below. All comments are welcomed. Please return this questionnaire by March 24, 1979 to:

Dr. Marianna W. Davis, Coordinator
CCBE
Post Office Box 3097
Columbia, South Carolina 29230.

THANK YOU,
The Coalition for The Concerns of
Blacks in Postsecondary Education
in South Carolina

1. Which age category are you in ?

4% <u> </u> 24 or younger	9% <u> </u> 38-45	0% <u> </u> 66 or above
17% <u> </u> 25-30	30% <u> </u> 46-56	
22% <u> </u> 31-37	17% <u> </u> 57-65	

2. Indicate your highest level of education. Check the appropriate line.

9% <u> </u> Bachelor's degree	
17% <u> </u> Master's degree	
26% <u> </u> Master's degree plus 30 hours	
4% <u> </u> 6th-year certificate, specialist degree, or special diploma above master's	
26% <u> </u> Doctoral degree	
9% <u> </u> Professional degree (M.D., D.D.S., LL.B., J.D., etc.)	
9% <u> </u> Post-doctoral study	

3. If any, how many children do you have ?

17% <u> </u> None
30% <u> </u> 1
35% <u> </u> 2
9% <u> </u> 3
0 <u> </u> 4
0 <u> </u> 5
9% <u> </u> 6 or more

4. If applicable, indicate the ages of your children.

9% <u> </u> Less than 1 year	17% <u> </u> 13 to 17 years
26% <u> </u> 1 to 5 years	17% <u> </u> 18 to 22 years
26% <u> </u> 6 to 12 years	30% <u> </u> 23 years and older

5. What is your present position? _____

6. How long have you held this position ? (Check one)

- 22% 1st year
17% 2nd year
9% 3-4 years
26% 5-6 years
26% 7 years and over

7. What was the title of the position you held before you accepted the position you now hold ? _____

8. What is your relationship to CCBE? (Check one)

- 9% Steering Committee member
13% Member of the CCBE Coalition (You served on a committee or attended meetings.)
0 Consultant
65% Interested Observer
0 Staff Member
13% Other (Specify) _____

9. In higher education in South Carolina, which do you consider to be your role ?

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 13% <u>A key person</u> | 9% <u>An interested bystander</u> |
| 26% <u>An important person</u> | 0 <u>Not much of a participant</u> |
| 52% <u>An interested participant</u> | 0 <u>Don't know</u> |

10. How often have you travelled more than 300 miles from your home in the past two years ?

- 0 Never
0 Once or twice
22% Three to six times
22% Seven to twelve times
56% More than twelve times

11. How optimistic are you that the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education shall produce a MASTER PLAN in postsecondary education that is favorable to Black citizens ?

- 0 Very optimistic
17% Somewhat optimistic
30% Uncertain, Don't know
30% Somewhat pessimistic
23% Very pessimistic

(MORE)

12. How optimistic are you that the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education shall produce a MASTER PLAN in postsecondary education that is favorable to South Carolina State College, the only black public college in the state ?

0 _____ Very optimistic
 13% _____ Somewhat optimistic
 22% _____ Uncertain, Don't know
 22% _____ Somewhat pessimistic
 43% _____ Very pessimistic

13. How committed are you personally to work toward the implementation of at least some of the recommendations put forth by CCBE to the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education ? (Recommendations have been published in CCBE's Report No. 1 and Report No. 2.)

0 _____ Top priority commitment
 74% _____ Major commitment
 0 _____ Minor commitment
 0 _____ No commitment
 26% _____ Don't know

14. For each of the following categories, indicate your feeling toward the category on a scale: Negative, Neutral, Positive, Don't know. (Do not omit any item.)

	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
a. Blacks should be maximized at all levels in the system of postsecondary education.	_____	_____	<u>100%</u>	_____
b. Black institutions should be competitive in goods, services, resources.	_____	<u>4%</u>	<u>96%</u>	_____
c. Blacks should be visible in key leadership roles in all institutions.	_____	_____	<u>100%</u>	_____
d. Higher educational institutions should fulfill the needs of the black community for professional and technical services.	_____	_____	<u>100%</u>	_____
e. Pluralism should be programmed into every postsecondary institution. (e. g. inclusion of Black history in courses in history, etc.)	_____	<u>9%</u>	<u>91%</u>	_____
f. All postsecondary institutions should be accountable to students, especially black students and poor students.	<u>4%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>84%</u>	<u>4%</u>

(MORE)

		<u>Negative</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
g.	South Carolina State should be meeting the needs of its students, not competing with white schools.	<u>26%</u>	<u>17%</u>	<u>53%</u>	<u>4%</u>
h.	South Carolina State should have a guaranteed role of leadership in higher education in the state.	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u>100%</u>	<u> </u>
i.	Denmark Tech. should be equal in budget allocations, resources, and programs to the other state technical schools.	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u>96%</u>	<u>4%</u>
j.	South Carolina State should increase its graduate programs, including at least one doctoral program.	<u>4%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>92%</u>	<u> </u>
k.	White student enrollment should be increased at South Carolina State.	<u>4%</u>	<u>40%</u>	<u>43%</u>	<u>13%</u>
l.	Black student enrollment should be increased at all white institutions.	<u>4%</u>	<u>26%</u>	<u>66%</u>	<u>4%</u>
m.	South Carolina State should have at least three top-notch professional programs. (e.g. nursing, engineering, vet. medicine, etc.)	<u> </u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>87%</u>	<u>9%</u>
n.	Legal research should be undertaken to establish the basis for demanding extra funds for South Carolina State and Denmark Technical School.	<u>4%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>79%</u>	<u>13%</u>
o.	The Federal Government discriminates against black institutions through its financial assistance programs.	<u>4%</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>43%</u>	<u>39%</u>
p.	The State Government discriminates against black institutions through its state appropriations programs.	<u>4%</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>74%</u>	<u>9%</u>
q.	All public colleges should have "open admissions."	<u>35%</u>	<u>17%</u>	<u>43%</u>	<u>4%</u>
r.	Recruitment, hiring, and upgrading of black faculty and nonacademic personnel should be top priority across all institutions.	<u> </u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>96%</u>	<u> </u>

(MORE)

	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
a. Black and White faculty salaries should be equal, regardless of past circumstances of Black professionals.	<u>13%</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>9%</u>

15. How would you describe your general political views ?

- 13% Radical
22% Very liberal
17% Somewhat liberal
39% Moderate
4% Somewhat conservative
4% Very conservative
0 Extremely conservative

16. How active have you been politically in recent years on each of the following levels?
Not at All Somewhat Very Extremely

a. National	<u>48%</u>	<u>35%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>13%</u>
b. State	<u>30%</u>	<u>44%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>22%</u>
c. Town or City	<u>13%</u>	<u>48%</u>	<u>22%</u>	<u>17%</u>
d. Precinct or Neighborhood	<u>13%</u>	<u>48%</u>	<u>22%</u>	<u>17%</u>

17. If South Carolina State were to institute five new graduate programs, which would you prefer ? Use numbers 1-5 in the order of your choice.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| a. <u>2</u> Banking & Finance | h. <u> </u> Journalism |
| b. <u>3</u> Computer Science | i. <u> </u> Petroleum Production |
| c. <u> </u> Consumer Economics | j. <u> </u> Social Services |
| d. <u> </u> Criminal Justice | k. <u> </u> Speech Therapy |
| e. <u>5</u> Environmental Controls | l. <u> </u> Theatre |
| f. <u> </u> Fashion Designing | m. <u> </u> Transportation |
| g. <u>1</u> International Relations | n. <u>4</u> Urban Planning |

- o. Other: _____
 p. Other: _____

8. If South Carolina State were to institute two professional programs, which two would you prefer ?

- a. FIRST - Engineering
 b. SECOND - Law THIRD - Nursing

(MORE)

19. Which three of the following criteria do you think should be used to admit black students to college in South Carolina ?

- | | | | |
|---------|------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|
| 43% a. | SAT scores | 17% e. | Other test scores |
| 100% b. | High school grades | 74% f. | High school diploma |
| 83% c. | Recommendations of superiors | 0 g. | Student's ability to pay |
| 0 d. | Quota needs | 78% h. | Student's self-motivation |

20. Under desegregation of educational institutions, how would you assure South Carolina State and Denmark Technical School of maintaining a BLACK CHARACTER? (Check the ones you prefer.)

- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| 0 | a. | Minimize white student enrollment |
| 0 | b. | Create a predominate black curriculum |
| 57% | c. | Increase the number of Blacks on the Board of Trustees |
| 83% | d. | Maintain a black, top administration |
| 57% | e. | Maintain a high percentage of black faculty and nonacademic personnel |
| 52% | f. | Create a viable alumni organization |
| 65% | g. | Establish the character through goals and mission of the institutions |
| 0 | h. | Label the schools as Black institutions |
| 22% | i. | Institute exclusive remedial programs for black students |
| 4% | j. | Other: <u>Provide academic support programs.</u> |
| 0 | k. | Other: _____ |

21. If South Carolina State is to have its own distinct character, which undergraduate degree programs (current or new) should be academically superior and especially attractive to students, Black or White ?

- a. FIRST - Computer Science
- b. SECOND - Engineering
- c. THIRD - Banking and Finance
- d. FOURTH - Urban Planning

COMMENTS - if any:

THANK YOU.

Abstract of Findings

Opinions and concerns of 14 leading black citizens on issues of postsecondary education in South Carolina are highlighted in this survey. This sample of 46 percent of the thirty survey questionnaires mailed out was obtained by the coordinator of CCBE, and the respondents represent black leadership in terms of age, marital status, profession, education, mobility, and political views.

Most black leaders are not optimistic about the South Carolina Master Plan in Postsecondary Education, that is, the Plan is not expected to be favorable to black citizens of the state. They also believe that the Plan will not be favorable to South Carolina State College, the only historically public black, four-year college in the state.

Having a major commitment to work toward the implementation of CCBE's recommendations, all respondents felt that blacks should be visible in key leadership roles in all institutions. They also believe that higher educational institutions should fulfill the needs of the black community for professional and technical services.

Of significance is the fact that all respondents said that South Carolina State College should have a guaranteed role of leadership in higher education in the state. And most respondents felt that South Carolina State College should have at least three professional degree programs, such as engineering, law, and nursing.

In rank order, the respondents gave the following graduate programs as desirable for South Carolina State College: International Relations, Banking and Finance, Computer Science, Urban Planning, and Environmental Controls.

Test scores, as a criterion for college admission, ranked very low among the respondents.

Finally, strongly feeling that both South Carolina State College and Denmark Technical School should maintain top black administrators, the respondents believe also that the undergraduate degree programs at South Carolina State College should be attractive to all students, regardless of race. The programs of particular significance in this survey were ranked as Computer Science, Engineering, Banking and Finance, and Urban Planning.

VI. RESEARCH REPORT AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS: BLACK STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA-COLUMBIA

Introduction

College attendance among black students has increased dramatically within the last fifteen years, both in real numbers and as a percent of all students in higher education. Excellent documentation of this phenomenon can be found in Black Enrollment in Higher Education: Trends in the Nation and the South (Mingle, 1978). From something less than five percent of total college enrollments in 1966, the number of black college students has grown to more than a million and now accounts for about eleven percent of the total; the increase has been, in fact, a major contribution to higher college enrollments during this period. Several factors have spurred the rise--among them an increase in the number and percentage of black students graduating from high school and (perhaps more important) the expansion of college opportunities for black students, particularly at predominantly white institutions. Following judicial and legislative action beginning in the mid-1960s which mandated integration of public institutions and provided programs of greatly increased financial aid for low-income students, the number of black students enrolled at some predominantly white institutions has increased tenfold. Well over one-half of all black students nationwide now enrolled in higher education are attending predominantly white institutions.

In spite of the dramatic influx of black students into white institutions, many predominantly white colleges and universities are still concerned about the low numbers of black students enrolled on their campuses--a concern, of course, heightened by recent action of the courts and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Adams case. Unfortunately, the actual number of black students in many predominantly white institutions does not represent the effort those institutions have put forth to recruit black students. Sometimes the proportion of black students does not reflect the potential of the school to increase its black student population. Special academic programs, increased financial aid for minorities, and minority student recruitment are widespread practices among institutions seeking to entice black students to the white campus. Few in universities question the intent of programs and policies designed to attract the black student with good academic credentials, but many wonder why such efforts have not encouraged higher numbers of black students to enroll at their institutions.

Why students in general choose the colleges they do remains a mystery even after extensive research; the question will not quickly or easily be answered when rephrased to ask why black students in particular choose or do not choose to attend USC. A related question deals with the special needs, interests, and expectations of the black student at any white institution. There is ample evidence that black students now enrolling at historically

CCBE is grateful to Dr. A. Wade Smith and the Black Faculty and Administrative Staff Association of the University of South Carolina for Chapter VI. CCBE includes these materials with the permission of Dr. Smith.

white institutions are not just black counterparts to their white classmates. The differences between black and white students—differences which include social, cultural, economic, and educational backgrounds—require programs, policies, and services not within the past experience of most institutions. Just what the programs, policies, and services should be and how they can be developed are matters of concern at USC as well.

It is unlikely, of course, that any single study of black students at one predominantly white institution can find the answer to either or both of these questions. Such a bold attempt was not the intent of this study. Its purpose instead was to gather the opinions, attitudes, and perceptions of black students regarding campus activities and institutional programs at several predominantly white institutions, including USC. This background will provide a starting point for the institutions as they sort through alternatives, programs, and policies in order to plan the recruitment and program needs of black students. While other studies of black students have been done (notably Black Students on White Campuses: The Impacts of Increased Black Enrollments (Peterson, Blackburn, et al., 1978), Black Students in Predominantly White North Carolina Colleges and Universities (Davis, Borders-Patterson, 1973), and The College and Cultural Diversity (Southern Regional Education Board, 1971)), no generally available current data were to be found on the attitudes and perceptions of black students enrolled in predominantly white schools in the Southern states.

Interest in appropriate institutional responses to minority students at both the traditionally white and historically black colleges and universities is not new to the Southern Regional Education Board which has already supported conferences and workshops on recruitment of minority students, as well as research and publications on related issues (Brown, 1973; Galambos, 1979; Mingle, 1978; Mingle, 1978; SREB, 1971). This study of black students at white institutions is in fact a companion to the recently completed study by Nancy V. Standley, White Students Enrolled in Black Colleges and Universities: Their Attitudes and Perceptions (1978). Clearly the issue of the minority student is as important as any facing higher education today. The results of this study should aid the administration, faculty, and students of USC-Columbia in finding viable programs and policies to serve all students.

The Respondent Group from USC-Columbia

Selected biographical data were collected on each respondent in order to describe and better understand the respondent group and to facilitate the institutional analysis of the data. While a more detailed inventory of respondent characteristics such as parental education, family income, and student-grade point averages may have proved interesting, demographic data on black students enrolled in predominantly white institutions can be more efficiently and comprehensively collected at the institutional level. The respondent data gathered in this study, however, should help the institution compare its respondent group with its total black population and give some general impressions of the black students enrolled in predominantly white institutions.

Most of the 414 respondents in this study were female (55.8%), less than 22 years of age (74.6%), and single (92.0%). These black students comprised 15.3 percent of the total black student enrollment at USC-Columbia during the Spring semester 1979. Almost all were enrolled as full-time students (91.8%), a pattern generally true of black college students (Mingle, 1978). The respondents, most of them undergraduates (95.0%), were fairly evenly distributed according to class rank: 26.1 percent freshmen, 24.9 percent sophomores, 29.2 percent juniors, and 21.0 percent seniors. The preponderance of undergraduates in the respondent group reflects the study's emphasis on those students and the general enrollment pattern of blacks in higher education. Graduate students represented only 2.9 percent of the respondent group, and students in professional programs accounted for less than two percent. This sample is representative of the universe of black students at USC-Columbia, when compared on age, sex, marital status, academic program, student status, and class standing. The responses were obtained by a structured, self-administered questionnaire.

Since more than three-fourths (76.1%) matriculated as freshmen, this indicates the prevalence of early decisions to attend USC. Undergraduate transfer students accounted for less than a fifth of the respondents, about one-half from two-year schools and one-half from four-year colleges or universities. Less than ten percent of the undergraduate transfers from two-year colleges and 55.6 percent from four-year schools had previously been enrolled at black institutions. Only one-third who matriculated as graduate or professional students came from predominantly black schools. It would appear that most of the respondents had decided fairly early in their educational careers to attend a predominantly white school.

It was also clear that most of the respondents intend to complete degrees at their current institutions (88.9%). Of the group who plan to transfer before degree completion (8.7%), only 1.0 percent indicated a preference for a predominantly black institution. About one and a half percent of the respondents intend to leave college before finishing their degrees, although most hope to return at some future time to finish.

A master's degree is the ultimate educational objective for 40 percent of the respondents; in addition, 16 percent plan an academic doctorate and another 16 percent professional degrees. Less than one-fourth intend to seek no degree beyond the baccalaureate. Less than one percent indicated no degree plans, and 3.6 percent would stop after earning an associate degree.

The areas of study most often mentioned as potential majors were business (19.8%), health and medical (17.9%), communications (10.4%), social science (9.4%), education (7.2%), and engineering (6.0%). On the other hand, library science, forestry, philosophy/religion, geography, theatre arts, ethnic studies, trade and vocational, and foreign languages were listed least often.

It is interesting to note that the majors chosen by respondents do not follow earlier trends indicated by the fields in which black students actually earned degrees. In 1975-76

black students were most likely to graduate in the fields of education, business and management, or the social sciences (Mingle, 1978). However, in this study business was the most popular major, education ranked fifth and the social sciences fourth. Degrees in communications, engineering, and the health professions were infrequent in 1975-76, yet students cited those majors often in this study. Obviously much can change between the time a student declares a major and actually earns a degree, but the data may well reveal a shift in student career interests.

Financing for the respondents' college experience came primarily from federal loans or grants, parents' earnings or savings, college or university loans or grants, and combinations of these sources, although it was impossible to tell precisely how much each source contributed to the funding combinations. One might conclude, however, that most of the respondents had to rely on every available source for funding their educations.

Attitudes, Opinions, and Perceptions

A questionnaire offered the student an opportunity to respond to statements in three general areas and in a fourth area to provide short answers concerning the advantages, disadvantages, and problems of a minority student at the Columbia campus of the University of South Carolina. In the first area, the statements focused attention on campus life and activities, and the student was asked to express strong agreement, agreement, disagreement, or strong disagreement with each statement. The second area, which concerned factors influencing the college decision, required true-false responses. In the third section, the respondent was asked to evaluate the importance of various ways to increase the enrollment of minority students on campus. Findings in each of the four areas are highlighted here.

Campus Life and Participation in Campus Activities. There was a strong consensus among respondents (94 percent strongly agreed or agreed) that their institution needs to give special consideration to the appointment of more black faculty and administrators and relatively strong disagreement that the institution is making sincere efforts to recruit and retain minority faculty members (59.7% disagree or strongly disagree). Most (64%) felt that black faculty and administrators are generally supportive of black student activities whereas the faculty as a whole (presumably mostly white) is less than helpful (48.6%), a bit biased (59.4%) and less than knowledgeable about minority contributions in their field of study (57.7%).

The black student respondents agreed (90.8%) that more consideration should be given to minority student interests and disagreed (60.1%) that minority students have ample input into the planning and organizing of programs to serve their interests: the former attitude is perhaps a reflection of the latter. Closely related in the respondents' belief that minority students are not sought out for their opinions or their participation in campus life and that white students do not take an active role in helping black students adjust to campus life (64.3% and 70.5% respectively). In fact most white students, in the opinion of the black respondents, resent any special consideration given to blacks. Help for the black student, it appears, comes primarily from other black students.

Although almost three-fourths of the respondents agreed that it is important to make friends of another race and reported that their social contacts on campus included both white and black students, they disagreed with the statement that the campus is as socially integrated as blacks want it to be (65%). On the other hand, they indicated that minority students do not generally encourage their white peers to participate in black student programs and activities. In spite of—or perhaps because of—what seems to be a generally negative feeling about their social life on campus, most respondents agreed (69.1%) that their feelings toward the institution would be determined more by their academic than by their social experiences.

Although very few respondents wanted to major in any ethnic studies program, most endorsed the idea of including these studies in the education of minority students (86.7% agreement). Such a response perhaps suggests the prevailing “whiteness” they felt on campus and in their academic programs, as well as an interest in knowing more about their own black cultural heritage. In what appears to be an inconsistency, most respondents agreed (66.7%) that minority students should meet the same academic standards for admission as all other students and also agreed (70.4%) that special consideration should be given to minority students for admission into professional schools of medicine, law, dentistry, etc. The higher enrollment of blacks in undergraduate programs than in professional programs may help explain this expressed need for special aid in admission to professional schools.

Factors Influencing Choice of USC. In an attempt to assess some of the reasons generally assumed to be influential in college choice, the respondents were asked to mark “true” or “false” for ten statements concerning their decision to enroll at their particular institution. More than half the students acknowledged that their institutions enjoyed good reputations in their home communities—a factor presumably influencing their college choice. Although the college’s reputation was the only “positive” reason identified by most of the respondents, the other reasons listed should not necessarily be construed as negative influences. Responses indicated that enrollment decisions were not unduly based on the encouragement of parents, alumni, teachers, or counselors. Nor would it appear that the respondents chose an institution either to be with friends who were also enrolling or to remain close to friends at home.

In light of the data obtained from respondents on financing their education, it is noteworthy that only a small percentage (about one-fourth) said that an offer of financial aid was a reason for enrolling. Either they enrolled in spite of the cost, or their institution’s financial aid offer was no better than that of any other institution.

Most felt that college admissions counselors failed to describe accurately the problems encountered at college. While the respondents may have been implying a failure to describe general problems as much as those specifically related to the black student, clearly admissions counselors could provide better information on potential problems for black students at white colleges.

Factors Influencing Minority Student Recruitment. Asked whether more students from their high school would enroll at their college if given the opportunity, respondents were almost evenly divided in their opinions. More than one-third thought their friends would choose to attend. However, it could not be determined from the responses whether lack of opportunity or lack of interest would keep others away. This section of the questionnaire required respondents to judge the importance of selected factors in increasing opportunity for enrollment of minority students on campus.

According to the respondents, the most important factor in recruiting future minority students was increased opportunity for financial aid. More than three-fourths of the students accorded this factor high or extreme importance. In this section, respondents also reiterated the importance and need for increasing the number of minority faculty, staff, and administrators and the need for sponsoring more minority-oriented cultural and social events on campus.

Over two-thirds of the students recommended that more institutional information be directed toward minority student problems and concerns. This need could in part be answered by the increased use of minority students and faculty in student recruiting and by more extensive use of minority admissions counselors in student recruiting--both measures deemed important by black students.

While more than one-half of the respondents thought increased tutorial and counseling help would prove important in attracting minority students, they ascribed less significance to the need for remedial and review work. Neither different admissions standards nor special minority living accommodations was considered very important as a recruiting device by the black students completing the questionnaire.

Summary

Like their black classmates nationally, the respondents in this study were generally female, under 21 years of age, single, full-time undergraduate students in predominantly white institutions. Most of the students entered USC as first-time freshmen, and the clear majority intended to complete degrees here, primarily in business, health professions, education, and communications. Most also planned to earn advanced degrees. The fact that recent black graduates had majored most frequently in education, business, and the social sciences suggests some change in student interests. Financing the college experience was clearly a concern for black students, and most were relying heavily upon funds from federal, personal, and institutional sources for educational support.

The respondents overwhelmingly felt that USC is not currently making a sincere effort to recruit or retain minority faculty members and that special consideration should be given to the appointment of more black faculty and administrators. Black faculty were judged to be more supportive of black students, in contrast to white faculty who were considered biased, not particularly helpful, and not very knowledgeable about the contributions of minorities in their field of study.

The black students thought more consideration should be given to minority student interests, including more minority input into planning and developing programs to meet their needs. The respondents felt isolated on campus, because white students generally did not make any effort to involve blacks in campus events. While the Columbia campus is not as integrated as they would have liked, black students also admitted making no special efforts to include white students in their activities. Nevertheless, blacks thought it important to make white friends and indicated that their social contacts included both white and black students.

Most of the black students apparently chose to attend USC because its recognized quality and reputation would confer advantages upon graduates, especially those remaining in state after graduation. It appears that most decided early to attend a white school and that the influence of parents, teachers, counselors, and friends on that decision was not particularly significant. According to black student responses, increased financial aid opportunities would be the most important factor for USC in recruiting and retaining minority students. Increased numbers of black faculty and administrators and increased minority-oriented campus activities would also be essential. Though different admissions standards and special living accommodations were not considered critical to recruitment of black students, more tutorial and counseling help evidently could be helpful. Respondents could have used more information—preferably transmitted by black students, black faculty, and black counselors—about the problems and concerns minority students would have on campus.

The respondents undoubtedly felt they had an additional burden to bear as minority students on a white campus. Racial problems, though not so evident as several years ago, apparently have not disappeared. However, in spite of the problems blacks encounter, the students as a whole do not intend to leave higher education or USC. In fact, most would recommend USC to black friends or relatives.

Implications and Conclusions

Implicit in the responses obtained from the survey for this study is the fact that black students choose, enroll in, and remain at USC—Columbia because they are convinced that the educational benefits derived from the experience are worth any extra effort, struggle, or consideration necessary. In response to that commitment, it seems appropriate that the University commit itself to meeting the special needs identified by the black students. The reputation of the institution alone will not continue to attract and retain minority students if the quality of life for those students does not improve.

To minimize the pressures and problems of black students just because there are no open racial conflicts—or to assume no discrimination because the rules no longer permit such action—is to ignore the evidence that the black students feel isolated, ignored, and discriminated against on the predominantly white campus. While one could easily conclude that the University simply needs to be less prejudiced (an admission that prejudice exists here), it is probably more accurate to infer that the white majority needs to be more

emphatic about its commitment to providing equal opportunities for all students. The black students' concern for their non-involvement in campus activities and organizations, for example, may mean not that they are being purposely excluded but rather that they are not being purposely included.

It at least appears that some individuals and groups at USC-Columbia are in fact making conscious efforts to overcome historical imbalances and to meet the needs of their minority students and classmates. One would not be hard pressed to find any major institution that could not point to some program designed to recruit, retain, or in some way meet minority students needs. Few institutions, however, would be as quick to claim overwhelming success for their programs. At USC, this effort is borne unduly by the limited pool of black faculty and administrators. Witness the Black Carolina students strident call for the enlargement of this group.

Direct and implied evidence from the survey suggests that a first step in meeting the needs of black students on campus is to seek greater involvement of minority students in campus activities and programs. Also, the white campus community must develop an interest in and commitment to activities organized by blacks. In short, USC would benefit from cross-racial contact in extracurricular, social, political, and academic activities.

Clearly, the data for this study do not include all the solutions to problems black students face at Carolina; nor do the results wrestle with the difficulties encountered by a white institution in meeting the needs of its minority students. What these data can do is provide additional insight into the attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of black students at USC-Columbia. In the process, they can form a basis for additional study and analysis for the development of programs and policies that will improve service to minority students.

Special efforts must be made to ensure black student representation in planning both activities designed for general campus participation and minority activities. In many instances involvement of blacks will mean direct solicitation of their input and support, while in other cases it will simply mean encouraging white participation as blacks "do their own thing." Under no circumstances should it even appear that black students are being denied the opportunities to contribute to or participate in campus programs.

Problems of prejudice and racism reflected in the survey responses are not easy to deal with or resolve. The least that one can expect, however, is a recognition that they do exist and an openness to deal forthrightly with the consequences. Administrative officials would do well to bear in mind several conclusions emerging from this survey. It is clear that increasing the number of black faculty, administrators, counselors, and students will help ease but not necessarily erase the feelings of prejudice, bias, and discrimination expressed in these survey responses. Furthermore, the University needs to be alert to tensions among black students themselves as well as between blacks and whites. Significantly, a number of respondents suggested that some of their problems were amplified by fellow blacks resentful of too much interaction with white students. In terms of racial issues, faculty and administrators must also serve as positive behavioral models for their students. Evidence of racial discrimination or blatant racial prejudice should be considered in evaluating faculty

and administrator effectiveness. In light of the fact that few important institutional issues are ever resolved without the support of a university's central administration, all programs, policies, and practices established at an institution—either voluntarily or by federal or state insistence—must engage the full support of the central administration.

Like most studies, this one has raised more questions than it has answered. At the very least, however, the issues have been more clearly defined by the additional data obtained through the survey. Ideally, these findings will serve to stimulate some creative programs and solutions at the institutional level.

The Policy Implications of the Report on the Status of Black Students at the University of South Carolina

The purpose of this section is to make the policy implications of the research study explicit.

According to the evidence, black students at the University are most strongly affected by the lack of a significant constellation of blacks in faculty, staff, and administrative positions, tokenism, and the recruitment and retention policies and procedures of the University. This document addresses these issues and based on the implications of the student survey, and offers policies suggested by the student response data. These issues should not be viewed as the only issues affecting black students, but simply that these issues are the most salient, immediate, and within the sphere of University policy.

Black Participation in the University Structure

According to the survey results, the most consistently held opinion by black students is that the University of South Carolina desperately needs to increase the numbers of black faculty, and staff. Overall on the items in the SREB study, black students achieve the highest level of agreement regarding the support they receive from black faculty members. Similarly, the survey indicates that black students view the white faculty as inadequate in meeting their needs. These opinions reflect not only the miniscule numbers of blacks in the faculty and staff positions, but also the "revolving door" approach, which seems to result in the high frequency of blacks leaving the campus community for other opportunities. The implication here is that one office unit (outside the mainline structure of the University) is insufficient. That is, one administrative position designed to address all of the problems of minority students (and faculty) will not satisfy the conditions indicated by the survey results.

These findings have other implications as well. Not only are the academic and service units with which students have daily or at least continuous relations lacking in the constellation of blacks available to meet the needs of black students, but the entire structure of the University lacks significant numbers of blacks. In its mission, the University must have dealings not only among its faculty and students, but with the entire Carolina community. This community includes business and political leaders, fans of athletic teams, potential students and faculty, parents, alumni, and friends. Blacks should therefore occupy

advanced or senior positions throughout the University's structure (e.g. Legal Affairs, Counseling, Dean's and Provost's Offices, Trustee Board) and not just occupy positions that specialize in relations with blacks.

Obviously, we recommend an immediate increase in the absolute number of black faculty and staff members is in order. Also, the retention of black faculty and staff members must be increased. Since the black faculty and staff composition of the University lacks the consistency, the stability, and the permanency of the non-black faculty and staff, those already here must obtain promotion and tenure when warranted by merit, and blacks should be hired at the senior levels of the faculty and staff hierarchy. Remember, the results of the student survey demonstrate that the black faculty and staff offer unique and intensive support to the activities of black students. We suggest that the University recognize this contribution, and reward such activity in rank, salary, tenure, and promotion considerations.

As a way of implementing these policies, we recommend that those academic and administrative units that have structural positions that become occupied by (as opposed to created for) blacks receive some type of reward. Further, an additional reward should be forthcoming if the position is at a senior level in the appropriate academic or administrative structure (e.g. associate or full professor, with tenure of course; associate provost vs assistant to the provost). This means that those units filling positions at the senior level with a black would receive a greater reward than those who do so at lower levels. For instance, such units may receive additional financial or personnel allocations.

Finally, according to the study findings, Carolina's black students perceive a reluctance or ineptitude on the part of the University to attract and hold black faculty and staff. We realize that students are unfamiliar with the problems of resource allocation by legislative bodies, declining graduate school enrollments, and the intense competition between higher educational institutions for good scholars, regardless of race. Therefore, we recommend the involvement of black faculty, staff, and students in the recruitment processes within the various units of the University.

We suggest that this involvement would be to the advantage of the candidate, the University unit, and the black campus community. Legislative bodies respond to innovative participatory initiatives. Peer and student contacts may possibly aid in the development of a resource base, as well as help to distinguish the University in the minds of candidates with multiple offers. Finally, black faculty and student involvement may help to erase the notion, as perceived by the student survey participants, that the University is not trying at all to fill positions with qualified black applicants.

Tokenism

The road to greatness cannot be traversed by a major national university while it ignores the contributors of its black constituency. Yet, the results of the SREB survey indicate that blacks at U.S.C. are not encouraged to participate in the life of the University

beyond their special "minority" status and activities. Black students feel that the faculty and administration does not fully recognize the diversity of the student body and does not encourage racial interactions or minority input into University policy. By their responses, these students view an increase in black administrators as a top priority. The implication here is that all members of a university's constituency should be represented at the most senior levels of the entire university structure. Simultaneously, the clients of a university--its students--should be able to display pride in the achievements of their group with the campus' activities.

For the academic and administrative units of the University, we suggest that the elimination of tokenism requires that blacks of national reputation, scholarship, and integrity be found, and wooed (with money, rank, and power) to the University intra-structure. This also means that the token representation of those black faculty and staff already on campus either cease, or that these individuals should acquire rewards for their token positions. (E.g. if a black faculty member's name appears in a grant or on a committee, their written permission should be secured in advance and their names should also appear in the budget.)

We suggest that the elimination of tokenism requires black faculty, staff and student input into academic, social, and political events on campus. We recommend that units of the University be encouraged to obtain blacks as leaders and participants for their extracurricular activities. Hopefully, by their involvement, black students will be encouraged to attend activities predominated by whites, and likewise whites will be encouraged to attend minority planned functions. Finally, this should eliminate the token representation of blacks at events which appear only to affect or interest blacks (i.e., black faculty and students seem to be invited to particular events only when black faces are desired for political purposes).

Recruitment and Retention of Black Students

In our opinion, the decrease in the "college going rate" (e.g. the birth rate 18 years ago and the proportion of those people who opt to go to college) means that the University of South Carolina should attract and matriculate increasing numbers of black students. According to the survey results, black students attend the University because of its reputation for academic excellence, and in spite of some financial hardship. However, there are some limits to both, and the student participants in this study are concerned about these limits.

First, because many blacks attend U.S.C. for its academic features, the future numbers of black students should not accrue disproportionately to one level of academic excellence within the University. In other words, the level of black students matriculating in General Studies should not compare unfavorably with black matriculation as Carolina Scholars (or general admission for that matter). This would give the unfortunate appearance that blacks obtain second class degrees from U.S.C.; consequently removing the incentive for many Blacks to attend.

The University should also continue to provide the means by which blacks ameliorate the hardships of college attendance. This means increasing the total, as well as per capita, financial aid package, and maintaining a four-year level of support of each student requiring it. According to the survey results, blacks attend U.S.C. at considerable financial disadvantages, compared to their options at other schools. The University must reduce these disadvantages, especially in the recessionary periods ahead, if it wants to compete for black student admissions.

Finally, regarding admission, the students who completed the survey suggested the need for increased pre-admission contact between applicants and blacks already on campus. They suggested that before matriculation, the campus should provide black students, staff, and possibly faculty contact so that potential students may have their questions addressed by those in the best position to know.

The retention of black students seems to depend on reducing the social and cultural isolation of the black undergraduate. To assist those who matriculate to graduate, the University should seek to alleviate the isolation that blacks experience in academic, social and political activities (e.g. Omicron memberships, "life services" activities, political figures invited by the President). It might be wise for the University to allocate funds to all student organizations on the basis of the diversity of the clientele served by the organization's activities.

Black students feel that participation in ethnic studies is important as a method of reducing the isolation they feel. Perhaps then, few students actually major in the area because as a part of the degree process, it has second class status. (It is interdepartmental major and no minor is possible). Obviously, this area needs attention. More importantly, blacks find it difficult to get the contributions of other blacks recognized in traditional fields of study. The majority of the survey participants found the white faculty less than helpful, biased, and ignorant of minority achievements in their field of study. We suggest that the University develop some mechanisms within its rank and salary structure to address those who ignore, discourage, and isolate this significant and growing position of the student body. Again, the application of rewards or punishments to the unit may discourage those individuals who's intellectual approach is designed to discourage and belittle non-whites. Of course, this must be accomplished with means that do not violate the letter and spirit of academic freedom.

Finally, for those students who seek such help, the counseling facilities of the University should reflect the diversity of the student body. Recent events have demonstrated that traditional counseling methods and personnel are insufficient in reducing⁸ the isolation encountered by minority students.

Afterword

The aforementioned policy implications suggested by the report on "Black Students and the University of South Carolina" are only the most pressing, immediate, and

impactable issues. It should be obvious to any who read the full report that all is not well on the Columbia campus. Until now, the efforts of a small portion of the campus community have served the needs of its black students. As the University grows, diversifies, and otherwise changes itself to assume the character of a great national institution, the structures and procedures of the past may prove insufficient in addressing black student needs of the future.

VII. EXCERPTS FROM THE CONSEQUENCES OF FEDERAL AND
STATE RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES
FOR TRADITIONALLY BLACK LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS:

1862-1954. A DISSERTATION

by Dr. William E. Trueheart

Abstract

Many of the current debates in higher education today focus on court orders to dismantle the dual systems of public higher education in the southern states. These deliberations, which threaten the extinction of many black land-grant institutions (BLGs), are limited by the paucity of accurate, policy-relevant information on the consequences of past resource-allocation policies on the present statuses of the BLGs.

This study analyzes the evolution of land-grant policies from the seminal Morrill-Wade Act of 1862 to the beginning of the era of desegregation in 1954. Major federal legislation and its implementation by the seventeen southern states in which segregated BLGs were established are critically examined in the context of the educational, political, and socioeconomic milieus of this period. The responses and strategies of the Conference of Presidents of Negro Land-Grant Colleges and its white land-grant college (WLG) counterpart, the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Experiment Stations, are assessed with respect to their influence on legislation and institutional development.

The central question is not whether state and federal resource allocations to the BLGs were inequitable and inadequate, but rather what forces allowed the shortfall in policy implementation and influenced the present disparate statuses of the BLGs and WLGs. The principal focus, then, is on the political, legal, and fiscal dimensions of federal and state policy and their effects on the developmental outcomes of the two sets of institutions and the communities they serve.

Chapters I through III examine the historical factors that generated these disparities and explain how fundamental policy decisions at all levels of government were translated into resource allocations. Based on the premise that the nation is on the threshold of creating a viable pluralistic system of higher education in which healthy minority-managed

Editor's Note: This excerpt printed with full permission of Dr. Trueheart. Taken from the author's 1979 dissertation at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, this material is deemed highly significant by CCBE, for it focuses in principle on the two land-grant institutions in South Carolina: South Carolina State College (Black Land-Grant) and Clemson University (White Land-Grant). A full reading of Dr. Trueheart's work is recommended to all educational and community leaders.

Note: Footnote numbers have been changed to accommodate this chapter of excerpts. The table numbers remain the same as used in the original text.

and majority-managed institutions can coexist with shared power and authority, the final chapter analyzes the principal policy issues that currently impede progress toward the realization of such a system. A methodological epilogue recounts the difficulties encountered in data collection by means of document studies and interviews in six selected southern states. The study presents tables showing resource allocations to the BLGs and southern WLGs from the late 1860s to 1974, and a chart of major land-grant-related statutes with their purposes, policy precedents, limitations, and statutory bases for allocations.

The principal findings of the study are these: that for nearly a century an unconscionable imbalance has existed between federal and state resource allocation policies and the federally mandated missions of the BLGs; that the deliberate and illegal exclusion of the BLGs from the benefits of major federal subventions is fundamentally responsible for the disparate developmental outcomes evident today in Black and White land-grant institutions and communities; that the federal government has had the statutory authority, since the enactment of the Morrill-McComas Act of 1890, to remedy these abuses, but has not done so; that the federal government's authority, increased under the Civil Rights of 1964, can be employed to eliminate inequitable resource allocation practices and to insure the continuation of viable BLGs; and that because of continuing discrimination against Black Americans, the need for BLGs is as great today as in the past.

The author recommends substantial enhancement of the BLGs, asserting that higher educational desegregation and minority-controlled, racially identifiable institutions are neither mutually exclusive nor incompatible policy objectives, and that minority-controlled institutions are essential to the achievement of a mature pluralistic system of higher education.

Excerpts

In 1872, South Carolina created an agricultural and mechanical institute as a desegregated land-grant component of Claflin University (a Black Methodist school), but it did not receive federal funds until 1879. Although Blacks represented almost 60 percent of the population, the 1862 endowment funds were divided 50-50 between Blacks and whites. Under the Reconstruction government, the institution received substantial state appropriations, but when the Conservatives returned to power they eliminated "integration," reduced state appropriations and the BLG share of the endowment.¹

Prior to establishing the Black land-grant component at Claflin, the 1869 Reconstruction legislature ordered the desegregation of the state university (now the University of South Carolina). Blacks were appointed to the Board of Regents and a Black professor of mental and moral philosophy was hired. Predictably, desegregation caused white faculty and students to withdraw, but Blacks continued to enroll and by 1875 constituted 90 percent of the enrollment. Such an invasion by people of color was anathematic for whites; as soon as they regained command, they closed the university and three years later reopened it as an all-white institution.²

The essential point is that even though South Carolina and Mississippi, along with Virginia (where the Black designee received 33 percent of the fund though the Black

population was nearly 40 percent), were unique because they set aside a part of the 1862 land-grant endowment funds for Black institutions, they did so only as a result of pressure on state legislatures by Blacks in concert with progressive northerners and southerners. The full benefits of the distributions were rapidly vitiated by native Conservative whites when they ascended to power after Reconstruction, and although the proportionate shares of endowment remained intact over time, state support for the Black institutions declined precipitously.

The irony is that most returning Confederate states, whose congressmen obdurately opposed enactment of the Morrill Act when first introduced in 1857, have disproportionately enjoyed federal resource allocations relative to other states in the nation because of the huge Black populations within their compasses. Further, since the 1860s the white land-grant colleges have received an overwhelmingly disproportionate share of within-state state and federal resources. Because of virulent racial discrimination in each of the states, Blacks have not benefited in terms of educational, social, economic, or political development in any way proportionate to their needs or numbers. Those who today are concerned with public policies to enhance Black institutions and educational opportunities cannot in good conscience overlook the cumulative effects of these disparities.

Because of pervasive hostility toward public schools and the widespread, long-cultivated belief of the slave-holding aristocracy that higher education was a "luxury to be privately enjoyed rather than a necessity to be publicly supported," it is not unreasonable to speculate that many southern states would not have established adequate public systems for any level of education, even for whites, until many years into the twentieth century. Viewed differently, although the hopes of Blacks during Reconstruction were aborted, it cannot be denied that educational reform during Reconstruction, the ardent embrace by Blacks of tax-supported educational systems, and the rapid acceptance of the provisions of the Morrill Act, set the stage for earlier development of public education systems in many southern states than would otherwise have been expected.

The Hatch-George Act of 1887: Enabling Legislation
for the System of Agricultural Experiment Stations

The Hatch Act was the second of three crucial land-grant college initiatives during the latter nineteenth century. The major new theme of this period was the emergence of applied science, and U. S. educators looked to Europe for effective paradigms. By 1887, agricultural experiment stations were scattered across the continent, successfully applying scientific techniques to farming.³ American educators, anxious to win the approval and support of the still suspicious yeoman farmer and to secure larger federal appropriations for the 1862 land-grant colleges,⁴ realized that the application of science to the problems of agricultural production would serve both purposes. The Hatch Act, sponsored by Representative William H. Hatch of Missouri, Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and Senator J. Z. George of Mississippi, provided funds for a national system of agricultural experiment stations.

This legislation revolutionized the character of white land-grant colleges in a relatively short time. The effectiveness of scientific contributions to agriculture greatly increased popular support of the colleges, eventually winning over the reluctant farmer. Research, already considered crucial for national agricultural development, was recognized as an essential function for land-grant colleges and the division of faculty time between research and teaching became more commonplace. Though the act made no provisions for engineering stations, they were established by several WLGs in later years as a result of the success of agricultural stations and the national demand for engineers.

Several policy precedents resulted from the provisions of the Hatch Act: (1) States received annual subventions of money as opposed to grants of land or one-shot lump-sum payments. (2) Annual appropriations of \$15,000 were distributed equally and directly to the land-grant college treasurers, by-passing state governments and launching a major change in federal-state policy relationships. (3) Reports of federal grant expenditures were to be sent to the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Treasury. This provision led to the present system of federal audits. (4) Specific applied research was supported for the first time on a nation-wide scale, and oversight and fund distribution authority was vested in the Department of Agriculture. (5) And significantly, the act provided an explicit standard for equal division of federal funds: "... in any State. . . in which two such colleges have been or may be so established the appropriation hereinafter made to such States . . . shall be equally divided between such colleges."⁵ (Unless otherwise noted, all emphases in quotations throughout this study are mine.) Southern conservatives, however, were sufficiently entrenched to persuade Congress to add to the above provision the following discretionary clause: "unless the legislature of such State . . . shall otherwise direct," the ultimate effect of which completely nullified the true Congressional intent of equal division of the funds between Black and white institutions.

The legal bases for apportionment of the 1890 funds between Black and white institutions in each state are shown in table 2. Using Alabama as an example, the table should be read as follows: the legislature determined that the apportionment would correspond to the percentages of Black and white students enrolled in common schools according to annual school censuses—column b. In the 1893-94 school year, therefore, the Black institution received 38 percent (column d) of the federal monies and the WLG 62 percent. Since it was well-known that there were many fewer common schools for Blacks than whites (thus proportionately fewer Blacks in attendance), and that every Black public higher educational institution would have to enroll many elementary and secondary students, a more equitable basis for within-state distribution would have been the Black percentage of the 5 to 18 year-old population, or 46 percent as shown in column c. The minus ("-") in column f shows the direction of variation of the actual basis of 38 percent from the minimally equitable basis of 46 percent.

In contrast to the rather crude Congressional standard of equal distribution of 1890 funds to each state—a measure not at all sensitive to relative population needs within and between states—the minimally equitable standard employed here assumes that resource allocations for resident instruction within states should reflect the needs of the groups served. A corollary assumption is that most state legislatures would not follow the Congressional pattern and distribute the funds equally to the WLGs and BLGs, although Florida did to the advantage of Blacks and South Carolina to their disadvantage.

The data show that nine states reserved less than the minimally equitable percentage of money for Blacks, two did not vary significantly from that standard, and five allocated more than the minimum. Significantly, seven of the nine states with minus variations had the highest Black illiteracy rate and the largest Black populations, ranging from 560,192 in Louisiana to 858,996 in Georgia. (See table 3.) The five states above the minimum, with the exception of Texas (489,588), were among the least Black-populated, ranging from Kentucky with 268,173 to Delaware with 28,427. Eight of the nine states that allocated less than the minimum were former Confederate states. In short, the distribution of federal resources was skewed in favor of the WLGs, especially in those states with the largest number of Blacks. In three such states, Blacks constituted 50 percent or more of the population in 1890: South Carolina (60%), Mississippi (58%), and Louisiana (50%). (See table 2, column e.)

That none of the BLGs was included in research and experimentation programs is an iniquity of great import for their development. Given the enduring necessity for region-wide development—made more acute by segregation—the return on the investment of federal and state dollars in the BLGs would have been great. In addition to the economic development aspects of research, experimentation supplied the scientific underpinnings for nascent land-grant college curricula. Without scientific foundations, the curricula were destined to focus primarily on manual applications and techniques of farming and mechanical arts—as indeed they did for decades at many BLGs.

The WLGs became instruments of state and national economic development policies and as such were able to command ever larger levels of support from governmental and private agricultural sources. Federal and state governments actively promoted the development of agricultural industry and productivity in order to accelerate community and

TABLE 2

LEGISLATIVE APPORTIONMENT OF MORRILL-MCCOMAS ACT (1890) FUNDS FOR BLACK-LAND GRANT COLLEGES IN THE SOUTHERN STATES:
PERCENT BLACK OF 5 - 18 YEAR-OLDS AND COMMON SCHOOL ENROLLMENTS, 1894-95,
AND PERCENT BLACK OF TOTAL STATE POPULATIONS, 1890

State	1890 Morrill-McComas Funds: Legal Basis of Apportionment	1894-95 Percent Black of All 5-18 Year-Olds ¹	1894-95 Percent Black of All Students Enrolled in Common Schools	1890 Percent Black of Total State Population	Variation from Minimally Equitable Distributions ²
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Alabama ³	Percentage of school population	46	38	45	-
Arkansas	Twenty-seven percent	28	28	27	0
Delaware ⁴	Twenty percent	18	15	17	+
Florida ³	Equally - fifty percent	44	39	43	+
Georgia ³	Thirty-three percent	48	40	47	-
Kentucky	Percentage of school population	15	16	14	+
Louisiana	Percentage of school population	52	41	50	-
Maryland	Percentage of total population	23	21	21	-
Mississippi	Percentage of school population	59	54	58	-
Missouri	Six percent	6	5	6	0
North Carolina ³	Percentage of total population	38	35	35	-
South Carolina	Equally - fifty percent	63	53	60	-
Tennessee ³	Percentage of school population ⁵	25	21	24	-
Texas ³	Twenty-five percent	24	23	22	+
Virginia	Thirty-three percent	42	34	38	-
West Virginia	Twenty percent	4	4	4	+

SOURCES: [Calculated from] Doxey A. Wilkerson, *Special Problems of Negro Education*, Staff Study Number 12, prepared for the Advisory Committee on Education (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1939), p. 80; and U. S. Department of Interior, Office of Education, *Annual Reports of the Department of the Interior 1896, Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1894-95* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1896), pp. 1332-33.

NOTE: Statistics on Oklahoma were not listed in the second source named above. In 1893 the territorial legislature in Oklahoma accepted the provisions of the Act. In 1899, one-tenth of the 1890 funds were allocated to the Black land-grant institution.

¹Percentages based on estimated number of persons aged 5 to 18 years old.

²Minimally equitable distributions should have been based on the percentage of Blacks of the total population of 5 to 18 year olds, i.e., Blacks of legal school age. Thus, "-" means the BLG allocation was less than minimally equitable, "+" more than minimal, and "0" minimally equitable.

³Percentages based on 1893-94 statistics (in columns c and d).

⁴Percentages based on 1891-92 statistics (in columns c and d).

⁵For 21 years (1891-1912), the white land-grant, University of Tennessee, received the "entire and undivided" appropriation, part of which however was used for an "Industrial" Department at Knoxville College.

TABLE 3

DATA ON BLACK POPULATIONS AND BLACK AND WHITE ILLITERACY
FOR SIXTEEN SOUTHERN STATES IN 1890¹

State	Black Population	Percentage Black of Total State Population ²	Percentage of Black Illiteracy ²	Percentage of White Illiteracy ²
Alabama	679,299	45	69	18
Arkansas	309,427	27	54	16
Delaware	28,427	17	50	7
Florida	166,473	43	51	11
Georgia	858,996	47	67	16
Kentucky	268,173	14	56	16
Louisiana	560,192	50	72	20
Maryland	215,897	21	50	7
Mississippi	744,749	58	61	12
Missouri	150,726	6	42	7
N. Carolina	562,565	35	60	18
S. Carolina	689,141	60	64	18
Tennessee	430,881	24	54	18
Texas	489,588	22	53	11
Virginia	635,858	38	57	14
W. Virginia	32,717	4	44	13
TOTAL	6,823,109	---	---	---

SOURCE: U.S., Department of Interior, Office of Education, Annual Reports of the Department of Interior 1896, Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1894-95 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1896), p. 1333.

¹The above source does not include data for Oklahoma because it was a territory in 1890.

²Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

national development. They were equally determined to foster well-funded land-grant institutions in every state to carry on this crucial development work in close cooperation with federal agencies. The importance of WLG research and experimentation to state governments is confirmed by the fact that in 1905, the states contributed \$.75 for every federal dollar for research; but by 1924, even with a 100 percent increase in federal funds (Adams Act), the states contributed \$4.25 for every federal research dollar.⁶ The President's Advisory Committee on Education described the national value of the land-grant colleges in terms of the development of leadership for rural life, but added that

. . . much of [their] effectiveness . . . has resulted from the fact that they have served as the centers around which to organize the federally aided services of agricultural research and extension.

The agricultural experiment stations occupy a unique and important place among the facilities of the Nation for organized research. They have provided research facilities for a basic industry in which the individual proprietors are almost universally unable to carry on extensive research through their own facilities.⁷

Although the BLGs were nearly a generation younger than the WLGs, their federally mandated missions were identical. But state and federal officials remained callous to the pleadings of the BLGs for substantive involvement in agricultural research and experimentation that served vital state and national interests. Instead, uninterrupted preferential treatment of the WLGs made them indispensable over time to the execution of state and national planning, economic development, and educational policies.

State Marine School Act, 1911:

Federal Aid to Another

Discrete Group

While the State Marine School Act of 1911 is not directly related to land-grant institutions, it is significant to the evolution of higher education policies and to one of the major themes of this study—the design of federal legislation for the express benefit of discrete groups. As the title of the act implies, federal aid was provided to induce certain coastal states to create nautical schools in port cities. Although the scope was limited to instruction in nautical education and the subsidy levels were lower than in land-grant legislation, the act was decidedly less categorical than all previous higher education legislation.

It affirmed previous federal policies and established new precedents. Perhaps the most salient was the initiation of complementary state and federal subventions, or matching grants, so characteristic of contemporary policies. The schools established received \$25,000 from the federal government and a matching minimum from the states. There was no non-discrimination clause and no provision for the creation of institutions for Blacks.

The BLGs had to be all things to all people, in indifferent or hostile environments, with virtually no political leverage and little money for their missions. The evidence of the wide-ranging responsibilities that the BLGs assumed is compelling and undeniable. Their

roles during these and subsequent years encompassed perforce all that the wealthier WLGs performed, at least in some measure. Through sheer tenacity of purpose, they persevered.

The BLGs were the preeminent Black public institutions in a pervasively segregated society, and every new wind of change stimulated by federal court decisions, new legislation, radical demographic shifts, wars, depressions, and economic prosperity presented unique challenges. The principal remedial and developmental public-service responsibilities for the Black populations in each state rested, in large measure, with the Black land-grant institutions. For the most part, comparable white demands were not directed solely at the WLGs because federal, state, county, and local governmental agencies, in tandem with private social service organizations, responded to the vast majority of white citizen needs. In light of longstanding white control of the legislatures, boards of trustees, and statewide boards of regents, whose members were often hostile or biased against Black institutional leadership, the BLG accomplishments are extraordinary by any measure.

For the WLGs, the circles of rewards for research, extension and other public services were complete, unbroken, and handsomely subsidized by power brokers in the public and private sectors. Armed with the security of continuous, undivided subventions, the WLGs maximized their development by concurrently advancing local, county, state and regional development. In South Carolina, for example, the legislature abolished the State Department of Agriculture and transferred its functions and fees to the WLG. In 1928, agricultural fees for state regulatory and inspection services, including a 25 cents per ton tax for WLG inspections of fertilizers sold in the state,⁸ yielded \$283,654 for the WLG,⁹—an amount \$4,300 greater than all seventeen BLGs received from all land-grant and Morrill-Nelson funds in that year.¹⁰

Summary Statement

The political structures of the southern states are the outgrowths and nurturers of agrarian economies; the WLGs have been inextricably entwined in both, as progeny and perpetuators, since their foundings in the 1860s and 1870s. It was clearly in the self-interest of the WLGs to amass money and power without regard for their Black "sister" institutions. Intrastate and interstate migrations of Blacks had little effect on their ability to influence the distribution of political prerequisites. Even years after Blacks were permitted to exercise their voting rights, rural white legislators maintained an absolute stronghold over local, county, and state power councils.

The consequences of these political realities for the BLG presidents were unrelenting: they could not undertake major institutional development projects without considerable risk; they could not attempt curricular reforms with confidence that legislative support would be forthcoming and continuous; they could not marshal political pressure through even subtle threats of the withdrawal of popular votes from recalcitrant legislators; and importantly, they could not depend on higher educational spokespersons and lobbyists to speak on behalf of minimum BLG operating and capital requirements.

Differential patterns of development for white and Black institutions were as much a consequence of the political constellations within each state and the nation as of the disparate educational needs of their constituencies. The educational and political constituencies of the WLGs were, and are, essentially identical. This was not true for the BLGs until recent years—and then ever so incompletely—because of Black disfranchisement and constrictions in their access to public offices and policy councils.

The extraordinary advancement of the WLGs reflects their expansive power bases at all levels of government and in regional, national, and international agribusiness complexes. Over time, the synergistic relationship between the land-grant enterprise and political power brokers was cemented through agricultural and engineering experiment stations, cooperative extension, and contributions to the economic advancement of individuals and corporations. The effects of the union of educational, political, and economic interests were considerably greater than the impact of any one taken independently. And a prosperous union it was, as the summary of total federal receipts alone illustrates.

Moreover, the relative national rankings of the WLGs and BLGs attest to the cumulative effects of discrimination and the disproportionate power of southern congressmen. In 1927, ten of the seventeen southern WLGs were among the top twenty recipients of federal funds in the nation, and four of these were among the top ten. By 1974, eleven southern WLGs were among the top twenty national recipients, and six were among the top ten. The BLGs have consistently fallen at the very bottom of the rankings, frequently behind Territories whose native populations were smaller than the Black populations in several states.

At the state level, the problems of establishing influential Black political bases were compounded by the single-party system. There were no effective forums for airing political differences on educational or resource allocation policies. Nor were there avenues for nominating candidates, white or Black, who were committed to correcting the injustices perpetuated by the monolithic union of land-grant academics and farming interest groups. The general public, accordingly, was fed pabulum "sweetened" with academic and political biases against the BLGs.

There were no incentives for the WLGs to share with the BLGs one cent more of federal and state resources than the federal government already required. Indeed, southern institutional leaders argued that, relative to other WLGs in the nation, they did not have sufficient state funds to operate quality programs for the white students in their institutions. White politicians, on the other hand, were not accountable to disfranchised and unrepresented Blacks. Under these conditions, they could ignore Black institutions and communities with impunity, and funnel state subsidies into those institutions serving their voting constituents.

The collusion of academics and politicians led to the inevitable argument that agricultural resources in the state should be invested in institutions where the probability of return was greatest. Thus the age-old economic efficiency ruse served the dual purposes of advancing the development of the WLGs and retarding the development of the BLGs. Given the combined force of the economic efficiency strategem and unbridled competition among

TABLE 7
SUMMARY OF TOTAL FEDERAL APPROPRIATION TO SOUTHERN
LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS FOR SELECTED YEARS

Year	WLGs	BLGs
1927	\$ 5,071,242	\$ 332,954
1939	12,943,783	508,528
1945	24,932,706	545,794
1955	38,201,487	645,040
1960	70,637,602	854,683
1969	274,851,659	1,603,998
1974	456,207,471	7,240,639

southern WLGs to develop the largest and finest university in the nation, issues of educational equality and equitable distribution of resources between Black and white land-grant colleges did not become objects of decision for anyone. That is not to say that policymakers and the general public were unaware of the injustices that inhered in the systems of government and education in the South, but rather that on-going public forums for airing and addressing these grievances did not and were not allowed to exist.

Because states were required to account for federal funds in annual reports of the status of their land-grant institutions, patent inequalities in every southern state were well known to federal authorities. Major responsibility for the continuation of the feudal systems of education rests, therefore, with the federal government—not only with the specific agencies responsible for land-grant program implementation and oversight, but also with U. S. Presidents and Congresses during the entire period. Apparently the racist attitudes and values that have been so often and facily imputed to southerners were sufficiently embraced by northern and western leaders to prevent their responsible oversight and intervention.

Legally and ethically, the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of the federal government had the authority to intervene in any and all southern states. The Morrill-Wade (1862) and Morrill-McComas (1890) Acts were, and are, legally binding contracts between the federal government and each southern state. Each legislature, in accepting the terms of these acts, affirmed the right of the federal government to ensure the just and equitable distribution of federal subventions provided under these and subsequent federal acts. Further, each contract implied just and equitable allocations of state resources to all institutions charged with executing federal land-grant policy. In short, each southern state was contractually entrusted with millions of federal dollars to be held in trust for the benefit of Black land-grant institutions with the express agreement that if a state violated that public trust, such state was required, under law, to replace denied allocations; if a state

refused to comply, federal land-grant funds would be withheld until state compliance was obtained. The federal government had never enforced the law with respect to Black institutions.

It was impossible for federal officials to plead ignorance of the systematic violations of federal law; Black leadership made sure that they could not repair to the shelter of their insular bureaucracies without exposure to the bald facts of state violations of the public trust. The Conference of Presidents of Negro Land-Grant Colleges, during its entire thirty-two years of existence, constantly apprised federal and state officials of the special needs and problems of Black institutions. The presidents invited persons of influence throughout the nation to their conferences (most of which, in later years, were held in the Washington offices of Education and Agriculture). They met with U. S. Presidents, officials from the Offices of Education, Commerce, State, Agriculture, Labor, Defense, Interior, Public Health Service, Social Security Board, Fair Employment Practices Commission, Farm Credit Administration, and the USDA Cooperative Extension Service. They met with leaders of major business corporations, representatives of major philanthropic organizations, members of the national press, the National Urban League, the National Council of Church Boards of Education, the American Council on Education, the Southern Regional Council, southern governors, legislators, commissioners of education, accrediting agencies, and constitutional lawyers and judges. They made special appeals for assistance to the all-white American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities (now NASULGC). They sent memorials to Congress and resolutions to southern state legislatures requesting increased appropriations.¹¹ Despite all this, little changed.

According to Dr. Rufus B. Atwood, President Emeritus of Kentucky State College and Secretary of the Conference from 1931 to 1955,

... these [Conference] programs were devoted to seeking more equitable divisions of the federal funds for Land-Grant purposes, especially the funds for the experiment stations and the Agricultural Extension Service ... the Conference, as such, did not succeed in making any changes in the way those funds were being handled, but ... it certainly can be said that [the Black presidents'] efforts caused the Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in the South that were handling and dispensing these funds to be more careful in their distribution of them, and how they were expended, and how the services were carried on as among white and Negro farmers ... [The Black presidents'] main concern was whether or not the funds were being fairly spent among Negro farm people ... the Negro people wanted the facilities of agriculture ... to have opportunities to do some experimental work too, because they felt that faculty members developed themselves through experimental research, and we must remember that all of this research was paid for by the tax money from the United States Government.¹²

The Conference of Presidents was established because the Black presidents were deliberately excluded from membership in the powerful American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities—a timorous exclusion since, at least legally, only seventeen of the forty-eight states mandated segregation. As incredible as it may now seem,

Black land-grant and other Black public institutions were banned from the Association for sixty-nine years. It is not an overstatement to say that the complicity of the Association retarded BLG development almost as much as the acquiescence of federal officialdom. Nor is it unreasonable to suggest that the Association encouraged federal indifference to the needs of the BLGs by disbarring active membership of the Black presidents. It is important to note that the Black presidents did not want to be segregated. In fact, the Conference of Presidents deliberately avoided using the name "Association" in order not to suggest a "Jim Crow" counterpart to the all-white association. Rufus B. Atwood stated,

... the Negro Conference was never considered as a duplicate of the white Association. It always looked forward to the day when there would be one association that would take in all of the Land-Grant Colleges. Those who formed the Negro organization in the early days were very careful not to form a duplicate association.¹³

Beyond gainsay, the history of the development of the national system of land-grant colleges demonstrates as unconscionable violation of public trust by the federal government and state governments in the South, and importantly, by academic leaders of land-grant institutions throughout the nation. Although non-southern states did not establish separate Black institutions, few land-grant institutions in those states assumed the responsibility for insuring that Blacks shared fully in the educational opportunities available to white residents. It is well-known that Black attendance at northern land-grant institutions was inordinately low for years—indeed until the mid-nineteen sixties. For decades, Black residents in the North contributed, through tax payments, to the support of nearly all-white public institutions while they were unmistakably discouraged from applying for admission to those institutions. Those who could not afford to go South or were unable to attend northern WLGs often received no higher education at all. Thus the five to six decades of northern denial of higher educational opportunities to Black residents greatly exacerbated the problems of Black community and institutional development throughout the nation.

It is hardly appropriate, therefore, to place the entire responsibility for past injustices on the southern states because they explicitly subscribed to legal segregation. The other states of the union cannot disown the culpability of de facto segregation and moral indifference. One might reasonably argue that however malevolent the motivations of the southerners, they at least made some provision for Black educational institutions. In an important and ironic sense, southern states, through segregated Black institutions, helped subsidize the education of Blacks throughout the nation.

The powerful policy linkages between southern hostility and de jure segregation, non-southern acquiescence and de facto segregation, and national leadership default must be factored into deliberations at all policy levels. On the basis of the evidence presented, it is not only reasonable and just that each of the southern states should compensate the Black land-grant institutions, but that the nation as a whole should share in the compensation. The national policy has compelling moral interests in sharing in the enhancement of Black southern institutions as a way of increasing educational opportunities for Black residents in southern and non-southern states. A system of shared remedies should be established in which there is a proportional assignment of on-going compensatory funding to the BLGs by each state and by the federal government.

FOOTNOTES

¹Robert Cruden, The Negro in Reconstruction (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969), p. 75.

²Ibid.

³George Rainsford, Congress and Higher Education in the Nineteenth Century (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1972), p. 116.

⁴A. C. True, "Brief History of the Morrill Land-Grant College Act of 1890," in Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Annual Convention of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges, pp. 90-91.

⁵Hatch-George Act, sec. 1, 24 Stat. L. 440-2 (1887).

⁶George A. Works and Barton Morgan, The Land-Grant Colleges, Staff Study Number 10, prepared for the Advisory Committee on Education (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1939), table 4, p. 39.

⁷Advisory Committee on Education, Report of the Committee (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938), p. 145.

⁸Fred J. Kelly and John H. McNeeley, The State and Higher Education: Phases of Their Relationship (New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, in cooperation with the U. S. Office of Education, Department of the Interior, 1933), pp. 92-93.

⁹Arthur J. Klein, Survey of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, 2 vols., (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Bulletin, 1930, 1:106-107.

¹⁰National Advisory Committee on Education, Federal Relations to Education, pt. 2, table 43, p. 209.

¹¹Clyde L. Orr, "An Analytical Study of the Conference of Presidents of Negro Land-Grant Colleges" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1959).

¹²Ibid., p. 96.

¹³Ibid., p. 99.

VIII. SUMMARY AND FINAL COMMENTS

Narrow definitions lead to misconceptions and needless omissions of many important ideas necessary to significant educational programs in the postsecondary system in South Carolina. Definitions, therefore, need broadening to encompass, for example, the new student, the new teacher, the means and ends of education, and many other important aspects of higher and postsecondary education.

The mission of all public higher education in South Carolina should embrace educational programs that attract students and that provide these students with opportunities. Assuring all public institutions that such a mission is both desirable and supportable, the state officials, through a master plan, must also strengthen the role of South Carolina State College, the only traditionally black institution in the state system.

South Carolina State College is a Land-Grant institution (1896), and resources should be available at the institution for research, educational services, experiments, and program development. Among all public institutions, availability of programs for black students is expected. But, more pointedly, significant program development at both the graduate and undergraduate levels is strongly recommended for South Carolina State College.

In public higher education in South Carolina, black student enrollment is low as compared to the proportion of black high school graduates and as compared to the proportion of white students entering higher education. A broadening of admissions criteria, a much improved counseling system, a meaningful developmental program, and an improved financial assistance program (research stipends, fellowships, teaching assistantships, etc.) are among the recommended suggestions for increasing black student enrollment.

Black representation on college and university faculties in public institutions in South Carolina is very, very low. Additionally, tenure, competitive salaries, research opportunities, consultant work, and many of the other fringe benefits found among faculties simply evade those black faculty members who are employed. Since Blacks constitute 31 percent of the total population in South Carolina, at least 31 percent of the total teaching faculty at each public institution should be Black. And this group should be spread across lower and upper divisions of the curricula.

In key, decision-making, top administrative positions in areas such as recruitment, financial aid, admissions, placement, auxiliary services, printing and publishing, buildings and grounds, athletics, etc., Blacks are noticeably absent in public postsecondary educational institutions in South Carolina. This needs to be corrected immediately through action and master plans.

Each of the governing boards, the trustee boards, and the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education should have a 31 percent Black viable membership.

Presently, black membership on such boards is nil or almost nil among all institutions, with the exception of South Carolina State College.

A summary of the recommendations found in this report follows:

1. THAT the mission of South Carolina State College be to educate students, particularly those in the surrounding nine-county area, in the liberal arts and in a minimum of forty programs, including ten master's, two doctoral, and two professional degree programs. Further, the graduate degree programs should include specific programs of significance for the ethnic minority population in these United States, and the undergraduate and professional degree programs should concentrate on those areas where Blacks are underrepresented in the job market.
2. THAT academic programs at South Carolina State College be increased to a minimum of forty by the 1984-85 academic year. Also recommended are the additions of adequate, highly qualified teaching personnel, academic and institutional support services, and adequate state appropriations for the full implementation of these programs.
3. THAT, by 1980-81, black, full-time enrollment at each of the twelve senior public institutions in South Carolina increase substantially across each institution and that each institution increase black full-time enrollment in specified undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs.
4. THAT, by 1980-81, each of the twelve senior public institutions in South Carolina desegregate its faculty in the appropriate disciplines according to the proportion of black students graduating with master's degrees in those disciplines.
5. THAT 12.9 percent of the personnel in thirteen non-academic areas at all postsecondary institutions be Black and that they be hired as key managerial personnel. The areas are: recruitment, financial aid, admissions, counseling, placement, auxiliary services, business services, buildings and grounds, student personnel, athletics, printing and publishing, and temporary systems, (i.e., international centers, women's centers, etc.), and public services.
6. THAT 31 percent of ALL members of ALL governing boards, commissions, etc. of state-supported postsecondary institutions in South Carolina be Black. Further, CCBE recommends that such members be very knowledgeable about the circumstances of Blacks in the state, about the history of Blacks and education in the state, about postsecondary education in the state, and be particularly sensitive to the needs and aspirations of the black citizens of South Carolina.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

GROSS PUBLIC ASSISTANT MONEY PAYMENTS IN SOUTH CAROLINA BY COUNTY: 1977-1978

County	Total	Aid to Families With Dependent Children	General Disability Assistance 1/	SSI Optional Supplement 1/
Aiken	\$1,559,668	1,518,184	26,698	14,786
Allendale	587,493	575,238	2,970	9,285
Bamberg	733,487	711,293	8,432	13,762
Barnwell	678,346	674,062	4,020	264
Berkeley	1,230,496	1,208,444	11,714	10,338
Calhoun	410,139	405,609	4,530	-
Charleston	5,838,070	5,662,108	30,430	145,532
Clarendon	998,573	964,561	13,068	20,944
Colleton	929,060	909,670	11,707	7,683
Dorchester	838,397	795,902	20,280	22,215
Hampton	738,679	719,288	7,710	11,681
Kershaw	568,211	541,587	11,063	15,561
Lexington	879,377	796,551	15,353	67,473
Orangeburg	2,884,145	2,824,552	22,206	37,387
Richland	4,254,310	4,056,419	52,942	144,949
Sumter	2,357,553	2,315,966	28,260	13,327

Note: Components may not add to totals due to rounding.

1/: Includes retroactive payments

Source: South Carolina Department of Social Services

APPENDIX B

SOUTH CAROLINA RESIDENT POPULATION URBAN AND RURAL IN
SIXTEEN COUNTIES FOCI OF STUDY ON DEVELOPMENT
OF SOUTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE
1970 AND 1960

County	April 1, 1970			April 1, 1960		
	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural
Aiken	91,023	40,854	50,169	81,038	29,653	51,385
Allendale	9,692	3,620	6,072	11,362	3,114	8,248
Bamberg	15,950	6,977	8,973	16,274	6,302	9,972
Barnwell	17,176	7,033	10,143	17,659	7,290	10,369
Berkeley	56,199	25,746	30,454	38,196	6,111	32,085
Calhoun	10,780	-----	10,780	12256	-----	12,256
Charleston	247,650	202,654	44,996	216,382	159,118	57,264
Colleton	27,622	6,257	21,365	27,816	5,417	22,399
Clarendon	25,604	4,025	21,579	29,490	3,917	25,573
Dorchester	32,276	3,839	28,437	24,383	3,633	20,750
Hampton	15,878	2,845	13,033	17,425	-----	17,425
Kershaw	34,727	8,532	26,195	33,585	6,842	26,743
Lexington	89,012	47,288	41,724	60,726	27,187	33,539
Orangeberg	69,789	13,252	56,537	68,559	13,852	54,707
Richland	233,868	198,161	35,707	200,102	138,931	61,171
Sumter	79,425	37,745	41,680	74,941	30,126	44,815
Total	1,056,671	608,827	447,844	930,194	441,493	488,701

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Decennial Census of Population, PC (1)-A42

APPENDIX C

REVISED CRITERIA SPECIFYING THE INGREDIENTS OF ACCEPTABLE PLANS TO DESEGREGATE STATE SYSTEMS OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

In late 1969 and early 1970, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) notified ten states that they had not dismantled their statewide dual systems of public higher education. The letters sent by HEW at that time advised each state of its failure to adopt measures necessary to overcome the effects of past segregation and notified the states of their obligation to file a statewide plan for the desegregation of their public systems of higher education.

For the past seven years the Court reviewed HEW's efforts to desegregate these systems of higher education. In 1977, this Court found that the Department's effort had not been adequate and ordered the Department to require six of the original ten states to submit new desegregation plans to set specific standards for those plans.

The Court found that specific commitments (were) necessary for a workable higher education desegregation plan. . . concerning admission, recruitment and retention of students, concerning the placement and duplication of program offerings among institutions, the role and the enhancement of black institutions, and concerning changes in the racial composition of the faculties involved.

Specifically, this Court entered a Second Supplemental Order on April 1, 1977 directing the Department to transmit to the six states of Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Virginia as well as the Court and the plaintiffs criteria specifying the ingredients of acceptable desegregation plans for their institutions of public higher education. Accordingly, on July 5, 1977, the Department published criteria which were amended one month later to take into account suggestions offered by some of the states.

The Court further directed that HEW require each state to submit, within 60 days of receipt of the criteria, a revised desegregation plan and to accept or reject such plans within 120 days thereafter. In September 1977, in response to HEW's request, the six states submitted desegregation plans. After months of intensive negotiations, the Department announced on February 2, 1978, that it was accepting the plans of Arkansas, Florida, and Oklahoma and not accepting plans submitted by Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia. On the same date, the Department announced that it would publish in the Federal Register, revised criteria which are substantially similar to the criteria published in July.

Where HEW has found that a state has not eliminated the remaining vestiges of segregation in its formerly dual system of public higher education, and is, therefore, in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, it is required first to attempt to secure compliance by voluntary means. When those efforts fail, HEW is required to seek enforcement either administratively or through the courts. U.S.C. 42 - 200-1; C.F.R. 45 - 2000d-1, C.F.R. 45 - 80-7 (d)(1), 80.8. These revised criteria are issued to assist such states

in the preparation of desegregation plans as part of the process of securing voluntary compliance.

HEW originally developed the criteria mindful of the instructions of the Court that they comply with constitutional standards and Title VI, conform with sound educational practices, and take into account the unique importance of black colleges. Based on its experience in applying the criteria to six state systems of higher education over the past months, HEW has determined that the criteria provide specific and effective guidance to the states and at the same time, are sufficiently flexible to provide for circumstances which may vary from state to state.

PREAMBLE

I. HISTORY OF LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The criteria set forth below initially were developed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) pursuant to the specific direction of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in Adams v. Califano, Civil Action No. 3095-70, Second Supplemental Order (D.D.C. April 1, 1977). The Court's Order arose from a lawsuit initiated in 1970 to require HEW to take action to enforce the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.¹

In 1969, the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) determined that ten states² were continuing to operate segregated higher education systems in violation of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Although the states were notified of this finding and were requested to submit corrective plans, no administrative enforcement actions were taken when the states failed to submit plans or submitted plans unacceptable to HEW. In February 1973, the Adams litigation resulted in a ruling requiring that HEW take appropriate enforcement action. Adams v. Richardson, 356 P. Supp. 92 (D.D.C. 1973). That ruling was unanimously affirmed by the full United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, although the Court of Appeals modified the District Court's order and directed HEW to attempt to secure acceptable desegregation plans from the ten states before commencing enforcement proceedings. Adams v. Richardson, 480 F. 2d 1159 (D.C. Cir. 1973).

In 1974, HEW accepted desegregation plans from eight of the ten states.³ Reports covering the first year of implementation were submitted to HEW in 1975. Subsequently, the plaintiffs in the Adams case sought further relief and on April 1, 1977, the Court ruled

¹/ Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides: "No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. 42 U.S.C. 2000d.

²/ Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

³/ Louisiana refused to submit a plan and was referred to the Department of Justice, which filed a lawsuit, (United States v. (Louisiana), Civil Action No. 74-68 (M.D. La.) in January 1974. The plan submitted by Mississippi was deemed unacceptable by HEW and the matter was referred to the Department of Justice, which filed a lawsuit, Ayers and United States v. Finch, Civil Action No. D.C. 75-9-K (N.D. Miss.), in March 1975.

that the 1974 plans did not comply with the criteria previously announced by HEW and that as implemented the plans had failed to achieve significant progress toward higher education desegregation. Based on these findings, the Court ordered HEW to develop and issue within 90 days specific criteria to guide the six states⁴ in the preparation of revised desegregation plans.

II. LEGAL AND EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLES

A. De jure segregation

These criteria will be applied to a state which formerly operated a dual system of public higher education under state law, if the Office for Civil Rights determines after investigation that the state has failed to remove the vestiges of racial segregation in its system in violation of Title VI.

B. Affirmative duty to take effective steps to eliminate de jure segregation

Where there has been past de jure segregation, states are required to take affirmative remedial steps and to achieve results in overcoming the effects of prior discrimination. HEW's regulation implementing Title VI provides that

In administering a program regarding which the recipient has previously discriminated against persons on the grounds of race . . . the recipient must take affirmative action to overcome the effects of prior discrimination. 45 C.F.R. 80.3 (b) (6) (i).

The 14th Amendment also calls for more than mere abandonment of discrimination through the state's adoption of passive or neutral policies. The United States Supreme Court has held that public school officials have "the affirmative duty to take whatever steps might be necessary to convert to a unitary system in which discrimination would be eliminated root and branch." Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, 391 U.S. 430, 437-38 (1968).

The affirmative duty to desegregate applies with equal force to higher education. Norris v. State Council of Higher Education, 327 F. Supp. 1368 (E.D. Va. 1971), aff'd per curiam, 404 U.S. 907 (1971); Lee v. Macon County Board of Education, 267 F. Supp. 458 (M.D. Ala. 1967), aff'd, 369 U.S. 215 (1967); Geier v. Dunn, 337 F. Supp. 573 (M.D. Tenn. 1972). Additionally, the Supreme Court has made it clear that desegregation plans are not adequate unless they are effective. See Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, supra; Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, 402 U.S. 1 (1971).

⁴/ The April 1, 1977, Order excludes Pennsylvania (by agreement of the parties to the Adams lawsuit) and Maryland, which commenced a separate injunctive suit against HEW's enforcement proceedings now pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit (Mandel v. HEW, No. 75-1494), as well as Louisiana and Mississippi.

Consistent with the requirements of Title VI these criteria set forth the elements of a desegregation plan which would eliminate the effects of past discrimination.

C. Statewide approach

The Court of Appeals in its en banc opinion in Adams directed HEW to undertake a statewide approach and noted the serious problem created by the lack of viable statewide coordinated planning in higher education:

The problem of integrating higher education must be dealt with on a statewide rather than a school-by-school basis.^{10/}

^{10/} It is important to note that we are not here discussing discriminatory admission policies of individual institutions. To the extent that such practices are discovered, immediate corrective action is required, but we do not understand HEW to dispute that point. This controversy concerns the more complex problem of systemwide racial imbalance. Adams v. Richardson, supra, 480 F. 2d at 1164-1165 (footnote in original).

The Department has followed this approach since 1969 because we believe statewide planning is consistent with sound educational policy. Thus, these criteria require not only that each institution pursue nondiscriminatory student admission and faculty and staff employment practices, but also that the state system as a whole develop a comprehensive and coordinated statewide desegregation plan embodying those specific affirmative, remedial steps which will prove effective in achieving significant progress toward the disestablishment of the structure of the dual system and which address the problem of "systemwide racial imbalance."

D. Specificity—goals and timetables

The District Court in Adams concluded that the plans previously adopted by the states had failed to achieve adequate desegregation progress and lacked specific commitments for change as concerns the desegregation of student bodies and faculties, enhancement of traditionally black institutions, and desegregation of the governing boards in higher education systems.

The District Court directed HEW to prepare criteria which would identify for the states the specific elements to be included in their revised desegregation plans. As the District Court stated in response to plaintiffs' oral argument on January 17, 1977:

What I do want them to do though is be under the compulsion of a court order to submit to the states certain specific requirements which the states must respond to and they should be given a timetable for communicating with the states, and the states should be given some kind of timetable within which to make response. (Transcript, January 17th ruling; emphasis supplied.)

In Geter v. Blanton; 427 F. Supp. 644 (M.D. Tenn. 1977), the Court quoted its Order of December 23, 1969, expressing its dissatisfaction with a state submitted desegregation plan in that the plan as submitted "lacks specificity, in that there is no showing of funds to be expended, no statement of the number of students to be involved, and most importantly, no time schedules for either the implementation of the projects or the achievement of any goals." 427 F. Supp. at 646.

The Supreme Court has maintained that in a system with a history of segregation there is a need for remedial criteria of sufficient specificity to assure compliance with the law. See Swann; supra at 25-26.

In keeping with the Court's view that the Department should submit specific requirements to the states, numerical goals and timetables are set forth in the criteria. The goals are established as indices by which to measure progress toward the objective of eliminating the effects of unconstitutional de jure racial segregation and of providing equal educational opportunity for all citizens of these states. They are benchmarks and provide the states the clear and specific guidance called for by the Court.

These goals are not quotas. The Department is opposed to arbitrary quotas. Failure to achieve a goal is not sufficient evidence, standing alone, to establish a violation of Title VI. In addition, the Office for Civil Rights upon a showing of exceptional hardship or special circumstances by a state, may modify the goals and timetables. Nevertheless, the states are under a statutory obligation to devise and implement plans that are effective in achieving the desegregation of the system.

Most importantly, under these criteria and the goals they set, all applicants must be able to compete successfully. States' efforts under these criteria need not and should not lead to lowering academic standards. States may need to innovate in seeking out talented students who will profit from higher education. They may need to broaden definitions of potential; to discount the effects of early disadvantage on the development of academic competence; and to broaden the talents measured in admissions tests. But new and different yardsticks for measuring potential are not lower standards. They can be more valid measures of true potential and talent. Taken as a whole, these criteria seek to preserve and protect academic standards of excellence.

E. Special considerations in developing criteria for desegregation in higher education

A state system of higher education, as with an elementary and secondary school district, is held to an affirmative duty to take remedial action to correct past practices of segregation and discrimination. However, the nature of the remedial action required of a higher education system will differ from that required of a local education district. The Court of Appeals in Adams noted:

However, we are also mindful that desegregation problems in colleges and universities differ widely from those in elementary and secondary schools, and that HEW admittedly lacks experience in dealing with them. . . . As regrettable as these revelations are the stark truth is that HEW must carefully assess the significance of a variety of new factors as it moves into an unaccustomed area. 480 F. 2d at 1164.

In Norris v. State Council of Higher Education, 327 F. Supp. 1368, 1373 (E.D. Va. 1971), aff'd per curiam, 404 U.S. 907 (1971), the court held:

The means of eliminating discrimination in public schools necessarily differ from its elimination in colleges, but the state's duty is as exacting.

And in Sanders v. Ellington, 288 F. Supp. 937, 943 (M.D. Tenn. 1968), the court stated:

Now in considering the time element for presentation of a plan, I have thought of the complexities of the problem. I recognize that the simple remedies which might be available to a county school board where there is involved a compulsory system of education, a free system of education, and assignment of students, are not available here. Colleges are not compulsory and everyone can testify that they're not free.

Higher education differs from elementary and secondary education in many other ways. Besides being voluntary rather than compulsory, higher education operates on a statewide or regional basis, not local; there are no "attendance zones" in higher education; higher education programs vary from institution to institution and are not uniform; students are free to leave the state or to attend private colleges in pursuit of a higher education.

Furthermore, from state to state significant differences are to be found and must be taken into consideration. In some states strong centralized "system" exists including four-year and two-year institutions; in others, the four-year and two-year institutions report to separate boards; in yet others, each institution operates under its own independent board. While none of these differences relieves a state of its obligations under Title VI or its constitutional duties, they must be taken into account in fashioning an appropriate set of criteria to be applicable to six states.

Accordingly, while desegregation cases involving individual elementary and secondary school districts are a guide to a state's duty to take corrective action, they are not dispositive of the particular methods to be designed for the dismantling of a dual system of higher education, for the desegregation of a statewide system, for the removal of the vestiges of racial segregation, and for the correction of "systemwide racial imbalance." As the courts in Adams have noted, these are indeed "complex" issues. These criteria are designed specifically for the higher education systems of these six states based on a careful consideration of relevant statutes and court opinions and with due consideration to the unique characteristics of higher education.^{5/}

^{5/} For a useful discussion of these issues see Note, "The Affirmative Duty To Integrate Higher Education," 70 Yale Law Journal 666 (1970).

F. The unique role of the traditionally black colleges

In keeping with the instructions of the Court, the criteria recognize the unique importance of traditionally black colleges in meeting the educational needs of black students. More than 80 percent of all black college graduates have been trained at 6/ black colleges. In the mid-seventies, black colleges continue to graduate almost forty percent of all blacks who receive 7/ college degrees.

Thus it is with good reason that the Court of Appeals in Adams recognized the need to take into account "the special problems of black colleges."

Perhaps the most serious problem in this area is the lack of state-wide planning to provide more and better trained minority group doctors, lawyers, engineers and other professionals. A predicate for minority access to quality post-graduate programs is viable, co-ordinated state-wide higher education policy that takes into account the special problems of minority students and of Black colleges [T] hese Black institutions currently fulfill a crucial need and will continue to play an important role in Black higher education. 480 F. 2d at 1164-1165.

Again in 1977, the District Court in its Second Supplemental Order, p. 4, quoted the above language of the Court of Appeals and went on to state:

The process of desegregation must not place a greater burden on Black institutions or Black students' opportunity to receive a quality public higher education. The desegregation process should take into account the unequal status of the Black colleges and the real danger that desegregation will diminish higher education opportunities for Blacks. Without suggesting the answer to this complex problem, it is the responsibility of HEW to devise criteria for higher education desegregation plans which will take into account the unique importance of Black colleges and at the same time comply with the Congressional mandate.

The Department does not take this language to mean that the traditionally black institutions are exempt from the Constitution or the requirements of Title VI. To the contrary, traditionally black and traditionally white institutions are subject to the same constitutional and congressional mandate to provide an education to all citizens without discrimination or segregation. White and black institutions are to function as part of a unitary system free of the vestiges of state imposed racial segregation. However, as the Court has instructed, the transition to a unitary system must not be accomplished by placing a disproportionate burden upon black students, faculty, or institutions or by reducing the educational opportunities currently available to blacks.

To achieve the objectives of Title VI, precise methods will need to be fashioned for institutions within a state, each appropriate to the task of overcoming the effects of prior discrimination in the particular instance. Each method will be enforced with equal force and

6/ See Elias Blake, "Public Policy and the Higher Education of Black Americans," Staff Report, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, 94th Cong. 2d Sess. 1976.

7/ National Center for Education Statistics, Earned Degrees Survey, 1975-76.

determination. Each method is designed to achieve the same constitutional standard.

III. CONSULTATION PROCESS

In the preparation of the criteria originally promulgated pursuant to court instruction, the Department undertook an extensive consultation process within the Department and with interested outside parties. In an effort to assure that these criteria were both legally and educationally sound, a departmental task force was established to guide their development. The task force combined the multiple disciplines and varied expertise needed to resolve the complex issues and educational policies involved in this desegregation process. Serving on the task force were the General Counsel, the Director of the Office for Civil Rights, the Assistant Secretary for Education, the Commissioner of Education, and the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.

The Department also embarked on a program of open dialogue and consultation with parties of interest. The task force members conferred with representatives of the six states collectively and individually. The representatives included college presidents, education officials, and aides to Governors. A special meeting was held with students who attend the public colleges in the six states and representatives of several national student organizations. Four meetings were held with officials of the amicas cariae; National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, an association of the presidents of 110 predominantly black colleges and universities, both state supported and private. Two panels of nationally recognized educators met for half day sessions to advise the Department.

Finally, plaintiffs representatives devoted many hours to reviewing and commenting on drafts of the criteria. They also convened a meeting for the Department with 28 citizens from these six states who are most familiar with the higher education desegregation efforts in their respective states.

The Department assumes full and sole responsibility for the content of these criteria. The consultations enumerated above were exceedingly helpful to the Department in the preparation of these criteria, but these discussions do not imply concurrence in the criteria in whole or in part by other parties.

Higher educational systems in these and other states are undergoing difficult adjustments caused by fiscal and demographic trends beyond the control of individual states. Accordingly, the criteria developed for the six states under the Adams Order, focused on desegregation efforts to be undertaken within the next five years. Similarly, OCR will seek plans that contain five year goals from other states which are found to have a duty to eliminate the vestiges of duality in their systems of higher education.

As each state attains the goals set forth in its plan, OCR will assess, in cooperation with that state, the progress thereby made in order to determine what additional steps, if

any, are necessary to complete the desegregation process. Furthermore, OCR will periodically review these criteria to assure their adequacy in meeting constitutional requirements, their consistency with rulings of the courts in higher education desegregation, and the mandate of Title VI.

ELEMENTS OF A PLAN

I. DISESTABLISHMENT OF THE STRUCTURE OF THE DUAL SYSTEM

An acceptable plan shall commit the state to the goal of organizing and operating the system and institutions of higher education in a manner that promises realistically to overcome the effects of past discrimination and to disestablish the dual system, and which assures that students will be attracted to each institution on the basis of educational programs and opportunities uninhibited by past practices of segregation.

To achieve the disestablishment of the structure of the dual system, each plan shall:

- A. Define the mission of each institution within the state system on a basis other than race:

Each mission statement shall include at a minimum:

1. the level, range, and scope of programs and degrees offered;
2. geographic area served by the institution; and
3. the projected size of the student body and staff, for each year of the life of the plan.

- B. Specify steps to be taken to strengthen the role of traditionally black institutions in the state system:

In support of the specific steps required by I.B., the plan shall include:

1. commitments that necessary improvements will be made to permit the traditionally black institutions to fulfill their defined mission. These improvements will extend to physical plant and equipment; quality and range of program offerings; number and quality of faculty; student, faculty and professional staff services; student financial assistance and other financial support;
2. commitments that traditionally black institutions will have the resources (including those enumerated in item 1 above), which are at least comparable to those at traditionally white institutions having similar missions;

3. an assessment of the physical plant at traditionally black institutions; and
 4. a detailed description of the resources, expressed in dollars and in numbers of personnel to be assigned, which the state system will provide (and the source for such funds) in order to implement the steps specified in I.B. reported by year for the life of the step or activity.
- C. Commit the state to take specific steps to eliminate educationally unnecessary program duplication among traditionally black and traditionally white institutions in the same service area:

To this end, the plan shall identify existing degree programs (other than core curricula) among institutions having identical or overlapping service areas and indicate specifically with respect to each area what steps the state will take to eliminate such duplication. The elimination of such program duplication shall be carried out consistent with the objectives of strengthening the traditionally black colleges.

- D. Commit the state to give priority consideration to placing any new undergraduate, graduate, or professional degree programs, courses of study, etc., which may be proposed, at traditionally black institutions, consistent with their missions.
- E. Commit the state to withhold approval of any changes in the operation of the state system or of any institutions that may have the effect of thwarting the achievement of its desegregation goals.
- F. Commit the state to advise OCR of proposed major changes in the mission or the character of any institution within the state system which may directly or indirectly affect the achievement of its desegregation goals prior to their formal adoption.

Such proposed changes include but are not limited to: the establishment or major expansion of programs of study, of departments, or institutions; the alteration of two-year or four-year institutions; the conversion of a private to a public institution; or the closing or merger of institutions or campuses.

- G. Specify timetables for sequential implementation of the actions necessary to achieve these goals as soon as possible but no later than within five years (by the close of the fifth full academic year after the plan is accepted) unless compelling justification for a longer period for compliance is provided to and accepted by the Department.

The plan shall include interim benchmarks and goals from which progress toward these objectives may be measured. These timetables and benchmarks shall be appropriate to

nature of the action to be taken. For example, studies of physical plant and resources comparability should be completed promptly; corrective actions (including capital construction) will require longer time periods.

- H. Commit the state and all its involved agencies and subdivisions to specific measures for achievement of the above objectives.

Such measures may include but are not limited to establishing cooperative programs consistent with institutional missions; reassigning specified programs, course offerings, resources and/or services among institutions; realigning the land-grant academic programs so that research, experiment and other educational services are redistributed on a nonracial basis; and merging institutions or branches thereof, particularly where institutions or campuses have the same or overlapping services areas. The measures taken pursuant to this section should be consistent with the objective of strengthening the traditionally black colleges. A detailed description of these measures need not be submitted at the time the plan is filed, but should be filed as a supplementary statement within 30 days thereafter for review and comment by OCR. Measures that offer no reasonable possibility of achieving the goals listed above will be rejected by OCR. Revised measures will be required before the plan can be accepted.

II. DESEGREGATION OF STUDENT ENROLLMENT

An acceptable plan shall commit the state to the goal of assuring that the system as a whole and each institution within the system provide an equal educational opportunity, are open and accessible to all students, and operate without regard to race and on a desegregated basis.

To achieve the desegregation of student enrollment, each plan shall:

- A. Adopt the goal that for two-year and four-year undergraduate public higher education institutions in the state system, taken as a whole, the proportion of black high school graduates throughout the state who enter such institutions shall be at least equal to the proportion of white high school graduates throughout the state who enter such institutions.
- B. (1) Adopt the goal that there shall be an annual increase, to be specified by each state system, in the proportion of black students in the traditionally white four-year undergraduate public higher education institutions in the state system taken as a whole and in each such institution; and
(2) Adopt the objective of reducing the disparity between the proportion of black high school graduates and the proportion of white high school graduates entering^{8/} traditionally white four-year and upper division

^{8/} For the purposes of this subsection, the term entering includes first-time transfers from two-year and other institutions.

undergraduate public higher education institutions in the state system; and adopt the goal of reducing the disparity by at least fifty percent by the final academic year of the plan. However, this shall not require any state to increase by that date black student admissions by more than 150 percent above the admissions for the academic year preceding the year in which the plan is requested by HEW.^{9/}

- C. Adopt the goal that the proportion of black state residents who graduate from undergraduate institutions in the state system and enter graduate study or professional schools in the state system shall be at least equal to the proportion of white state residents who graduate from undergraduate institutions in the state system and enter such schools.

This goal (and interim benchmarks or goals) shall be separately stated for each major field of graduate and professional study. To assure that this goal can be met in the immediate future special recruitment efforts should be considered at traditionally black institutions. Particular attention should be given to increasing black student enrollment and graduation from those traditionally white four-year undergraduate institutions which serve as the feeder institutions for the graduate and professional schools. Achievement of this goal is of particular importance in light of the specific concern expressed by the Court of Appeals in Adams. In assessing progress toward this goal, OCR will give consideration to the number of blacks from each state who enroll in graduate and professional schools outside the state system.

- D. Adopt the goal of increasing the total proportion of white students attending traditionally black institutions.

Increased participation by white students at traditionally black institutions must be a part of the process of desegregation of the statewide system of higher education. However, pursuant to the admonition of the courts in Adams, "The desegregation process should take into account the unequal status of the Black colleges and the real danger that desegregation will diminish higher education opportunities for Blacks." Civil Action No. 3095-70, Second Supplemental Order at p. 4. The following steps are designed to guard against the diminution of higher educational opportunities for black students, to take into account the unique importance of traditionally black colleges and to comply with the mandate of Title VI. Establishment of numerical goals for the enrollment of white students at traditionally black institutions must be preceded by an increasing enrollment of black students in the

9/ Thus, where the present entry by black students in four year traditionally white institutions is at a rate of 1,000 students per year and a fully proportional rate would be 3,000 students per year, the state's goal would be an entry rate of 2,000 students per year five years thereafter. A state where the present entry is at a rate of only 500 students per year and full proportionality would be 3,000 students per year and by that date have to close half the gap (by a rate of 1,750 per year) but only achieve an entry rate of 1,250 students, which is 150 percent over its present rate of 500.

higher education system and at the traditionally white institutions, as is required by Section II of these criteria. It must also be preceded by the accomplishment of specific steps to strengthen the role of traditionally black institutions, eliminate program duplication, locate new programs at black institutions, and by such other measures as are set forth in Section I.

OCR shall annually review the progress made by each state in increasing participation by black students in higher education, and in the disestablishment of the dual school system. Two years after the commencement of the plan, and consistent with such progress, each state system shall specify annual numerical goals for increasing the participation of white students attending the traditionally black institutions.

- E. Commit the state to take all reasonable steps to reduce any disparity between the proportion of black and white students completing and graduating from the two-year, four-year and graduate public institutions of higher education, and establish interim goals, to be specified by the state system for achieving annual progress.
- F. Commit the state to expand mobility between two-year and four-year institutions as a means of meeting the goals set forth in these criteria.
- G. Specify numeric goals for II.A, B, and C, and timetables for sequential implementation of actions necessary to achieve these goals as soon as possible but not later than within five years unless another date is specified in this section.
- H. Commit the state and all its involved agencies and subdivisions to specific measures to achieve these goals.

Such measures may include, but are not limited to reviewing, monitoring, and revising, as necessary, procedures for student recruitment, admissions, compensatory instruction, counseling, financial aid, and staff and faculty development programs. The detailed description of these measures need not be submitted at the time the plan is filed, but should be filed as a supplementary statement within 30 days thereafter for review and comment by OCR. Measures that offer no reasonable possibility of achieving the numerical goals will be rejected by OCR. Revised measures will be required before the plan can be accepted.

III. DESEGREGATION OF FACULTY, ADMINISTRATIVE STAFFS, NON-ACADEMIC PERSONNEL, AND GOVERNING BOARDS

An acceptable plan shall commit the state system to the goal of increasing the number and proportion of black employees, academic and non-academic, throughout the system and of increasing representation of black citizens among appointive positions on the governing boards of the state system and of individual institutions.

To achieve the desegregation of faculty, administrators, other personnel, and governing boards, each plan shall:

- A. Adopt the goal that the proportion of black faculty and of administrators at each institution and on the staffs of each governing board, or any other state higher education entity, in positions not requiring the doctoral degree, shall at least equal the proportion of black students graduating with masters degrees in the appropriate discipline from institutions within the state system, or the proportion of black individuals with the required credentials for such positions in the relevant labor market area, whichever is greater.
- B. Adopt the goal that the proportion of black faculty and of administrators at each institution and on the staffs of each governing board or any other state higher education entity, in positions requiring the doctoral degree, shall at least equal the proportion of black individuals with the credentials required for such positions in the relevant labor market area.
- C. Adopt the goal that the proportion of black non-academic personnel (by job category) at each institution and on the staffs of each governing board or any other state higher education entity, shall at least equal the proportion of black persons in the relevant labor market area.
- D. Assure hereafter and until the foregoing goals are met that for the traditionally white institutions as a whole, the proportion of blacks hired to fill faculty and administrative vacancies shall not be less than the proportion of black individuals with the credentials required for such positions in the relevant labor market area.
- E. Specify numeric goals and timetables for sequential implementation of the actions necessary to achieve these objectives including interim benchmarks from which progress toward the objectives may be measured.

These goals, timetables, and benchmarks shall be established in light of, and shall specify, the current and projected rates of vacancies in the various job categories, present and projected labor market availability, and other relevant factors.

- F. Commit the state system to take specific measures to achieve these objectives.

Such measures may include, but are not limited to employment programs providing centralized recruitment, vacancy and applicant listings; transfer options; faculty development programs permitting release time for black faculty to attain the terminal degree; and the interchange of faculty on a temporary or permanent basis among

traditionally white and traditionally black institutions within the state system. The detailed description of these measures need not be submitted at the time the plan is filed, but should be filed as a supplementary statement within 30 days thereafter for review and comment by OCR. Measures that offer no reasonable possibility of achieving the goals listed above will be rejected by OCR. Revised measures will be required before the plan can be accepted.

IV. SUBMISSION OF PLANS AND MONITORING

- A. After HEW has determined that a state has not eliminated the vestiges of desegregation in its former dual system of public higher education, the state shall submit to OCR a desegregation plan for its system of public higher education to implement the foregoing criteria.
 - 1. The plan shall commit the state to substantial progress toward each of the goals in the first two years of the plan.
 - 2. The plan shall be signed by the governor and by each official or designated person representing the agencies, associations, commissions, offices, and/or institutions responsible for adopting the systemwide and institutional goals described therein. Such persons or entities must be authorized under state law to perform all actions necessary to achieve these goals.
 - 3. The plan shall certify that achievement of the goals and interim benchmarks specified therein has been adopted as official policy of each official or agency.
- B. It is recommended that each state establish a biracial citizens advisory/monitoring committee to assist the state in monitoring the implementation of the plan.

Adopt the goal of increasing the numbers of black persons appointed to systemwide and institutional governing boards and agencies so that these boards may be more representative of the racial population of the state of the area served.

- C. Each state shall submit to OCR by August 15 of each year after a plan's acceptance, a comprehensive narrative assessment of its desegregation efforts in the most recent academic year. This narrative assessment shall include:
 - 1. a description of the specific measures which have been taken to achieve the objectives enumerated in the plan and in the criteria;

2. a description of the results achieved, including quantitative indices where appropriate or required;
 3. an analysis of the reasons why any steps taken proved inadequate or insufficient; and
 4. a description of the steps the state will take to achieve progress and to maintain the timetables set forth in the plan.
- D. OCR shall review such narrative reports. If good cause for the failure to meet interim goals is not demonstrated, OCR may impose more stringent requirements, including advance approval by OCR of desegregation methods, in order to assure achievement of the goals of the plan. In the alternative, the Department may initiate enforcement proceedings under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, if compliance with Title VI cannot be achieved by voluntary means.
- E. Each plan shall provide that the state will furnish to OCR statistical reports, assessments, and such other information as OCR may deem necessary from time to time in order to determine the effectiveness of the state's efforts to achieve the goals described in these criteria. Such information shall include annual statistical reports in substantially the same format used previously by the affected states pursuant to earlier desegregation plans. Specific dates for the submission of the reports will be established by OCR. In the event that subsequent developments call for the submission of additional data, such requirements will be announced after consultation with the states, and the states and institutions shall have sufficient time to develop the system needed for the gathering of additional data.

V. DEFINITIONS

As used in these criteria:

- A. "Department" refers to the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In instances where the "Department" is to take certain actions, they may be performed by the Office for Civil Rights or the Director, Office for Civil Rights, on behalf of the Department.
- B. "Institution" means any school, college, junior or community college, university, professional or graduate school, administered by or as an agency of the state government. Four-year institution means any school, college, or university that offers a baccalaureate or graduate degree. For the purposes of these criteria, "institution" does not refer to private schools or colleges.

- C. "State system" means the aggregate of all state public institutions of higher education within the state, whether or not under the governance of the same state agency or board.
- D. "Student" means any person enrolled in an instructional program, whether full-time or part-time, subject to exceptions to be specified by the Office for Civil Rights.
- E. "Faculty" means all persons employed by an institution as full-time instructional personnel;
- F. "Labor market area" means the geographical area in which an institution or campus traditionally recruits or draws applicants possessing the requisite credentials for vacancies in faculty, administrative, or non-academic personnel positions.
- G. "Governing board" means that appointed or elected body, whether or not responsible to the governor of a state or to the state legislature, which is charged under state law with the ultimate responsibility for the administration and operation of institutions within the state system of public higher education. A "governing board" may be responsible for the entire system, for a single campus or institution thereof, or for a specified group of campuses or institutions.

DATED: February 2, 1978

David S. Tatel, Director
Office for Civil Rights
(Officially signed by Mr. Tatel)

APPENDIX D

Distribution of Faculty by Race and Discipline 4-Year Institutions

Discipline	HEGIS Field Code	Black	White	Other Minority	Minority, Not Specified	Total
General Studies	0	130	696	26	6	858
Agriculture	100	175	3,824	66	9	4,074
Forestry	114	0	279	15	0	294
Architecture & Design	200	27	664	27	3	721
Area Studies	300	0	40	0	0	40
Biological Sciences	400	347	3,598	130	21	4,096
Pathology	408	1	152	19	0	172
Pharmacology	409	0	190	6	0	196
Physiology	410	1	266	10	0	277
Microbiology	411	8	334	32	0	374
Anatomy	412	0	244	20	0	264
Biochemistry	414	0	212	12	0	224
Business & Management	500	303	4,465	164	26	4,958
Accounting	502	29	677	14	0	720
Business Management	506	67	737	32	1	837
Secretarial Studies	514	20	197	0	0	217
Business Economics	517	10	289	45	0	344
Communications	600	51	842	9	2	904
Computer & Information Sciences	700	40	583	41	9	673
Education	800	1,636	9,194	153	35	11,018
Physical & Health Education	835	405	1,644	21	15	2,085
Industrial Arts & Technology	839	180	600	17	5	802
Engineering	900	75	3,417	234	70	3,796
Civil-Construction-Transportation	908	4	362	34	1	401
Electronics Engineering	909	12	459	37	2	510
Mechanical Engineering	910	18	375	42	2	437
Engineering Technology	925	56	176	22	3	257
Fine & Applied Arts	1000	274	3,965	65	8	4,312
Music	1004	147	1,286	26	8	1,467
Foreign Languages	1100	131	1,914	141	31	2,217
Health Professions	1200	197	2,932	80	17	3,226
Nursing	1203	135	2,234	21	0	2,390
Dentistry	1204	9	681	24	0	714
Medicine	1206	44	4,221	296	25	4,586
Pharmacy	1211	5	371	15	4	395
Veterinary Medicine	1218	4	349	11	2	366
Home Economics	1300	212	1,288	52	1	1,553
Law	1400	71	997	16	18	1,102
Letters	1500	640	6,067	103	13	6,823
Library Science	1600	71	415	10	0	496
Mathematics	1700	333	2,995	246	25	3,599
Military Science	1800	60	215	3	0	278
Physical Science	1900	164	3,517	175	80	3,936

(continued)

FROM: Southern Regional Education Board, Racial Composition of Faculties in Public Colleges and Universities of the South, 1979.

APPENDIX D--Continued

Distribution of Faculty by Race and Discipline 4-Year Institutions (continued)

Discipline	HEGIS Field Code	Black	White	Other Minority	Minority, Not Specified	Total
Physics	1902	55	731	115	0 *	901
Geology	1914	14	337	6	4	361
Psychology	2000	173	1,947	45	5	2,170
Public Affairs & Service	2100	107	607	11	2	727
Social Work & Help	2104	123	533	20	3	679
Social Sciences	2200	323	3,535	118	38	4,014
Economics	2204	26	485	35	0	546
History	2205	197	1,551	25	1	1,774
Political Science	2207	71	806	36	5	918
Sociology	2208	146	958	36	3	1,143
Interdisciplinary Studies	4900	25	387	1	2	415
Business & Commerce Technology	5000	5	205	4	0	214
Secretarial Technology	5005	0	7	0	0	7
Health Services Technology	5200	16	142	0	0	158
Nursing (R.N.)	5208	34	139	4	2	179
Mechanical & Engineering Technology	5300	11	34	1	4	50
Natural Science Technology	5400	0	10	0	0	10
Public Service Technology	5500	0	8	0	0	8
Arts & Sciences	5600	84	127	22	0	233
Letters & Arts	5650	145	3,596	193	8	3,942
Science & Mathematics	5670	57	1,454	83	1	1,595
All Fields		7,704	85,562	3,267	520	97,053

APPENDIX E

Legal Basis for Affirmative Action

Document	Issued By Whom	Date	Major Provisions	Enforcement Power
Executive Order 8802	Franklin D. Roosevelt	June 25, 1941	Urged defense industry to hire workers without regard to race, creed, color or national origin; established committee on Fair Employment Practices to investigate complaints.	None
Executive Order 9346	Franklin D. Roosevelt	May 27, 1943	Urged government contractors and subcontractors to end discriminatory hiring practices.	None
Executive Order 9980	Harry S. Truman	July 26, 1948	Ordered hiring in federal government to be done solely on the basis of merit.	None
Executive Order 10308	Harry S. Truman	December 3, 1951	Established Committee on Government Compliance. Purpose of Committee: (1) to examine and study rules, procedures, and practices of government contractors; (2) to confer and advise with government contracting officials.	None
Executive Order 10479	Dwight D. Eisenhower	August 13, 1953	Created Government Contract Committee. Purpose of Committee: (1) to make recommendations for improving nondiscrimination provisions; (2) to receive complaints of discrimination.	None

Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education: A Report
 Institute for the Study of Educational Policy,
 Howard University, Washington, D. C., 1978.

Affirmative Action and the Law

APPENDIX E--Continued

Document	Issued By Whom	Date	Major Provisions	Enforcement Power
Executive Order 10557	Dwight D. Eisenhower	September 3, 1954	Required government contractors to include nondiscriminatory provisions in employment, upgrading, demotion, of transfers; recruitment or recruitment advertising; layoff or termination.	None
1957 Civil Rights Act	United States Congress	September 9, 1957	Created Commission on Civil Rights to (1) study and collect information regarding the denial of equal protection of the laws; (2) evaluate laws and policies of federal government in regard to equal protection of the laws.	None
Executive Order 10925	John F. Kennedy	March 6, 1961	Created President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. Government contractors urged to end racial discrimination in employment.	Limited-committee had the power to impose sanctions and penalties on government contractors who failed to comply with nondiscriminatory provisions.
Title VI of 1964 Civil Rights Act	United States Congress	July 2, 1964	Prohibited racial discrimination in any programs or activities receiving federal funds.	Termination of or refusal of funds by federal departments or agencies upon finding of discrimination.
Title VII of 1964 Civil Rights Act	United States Congress	July 2, 1964	Prohibited racial discrimination in employment by employers of 25 or more persons.	Limited-EEOC created. Purpose of Commission: (1) to investigate and to resolve complaints of discrimination; (2) to bring suits against those employers found guilty of discrimination.

Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education: A Report

Affirmative Action and the Law

APPENDIX E--Continued

Document	Issued By Whom	Date	Major Provisions	Enforcement Power
Executive Order 11246	Lyndon B. Johnson	September 24, 1965	Contractor to take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or or national origin.	Secretary of Labor may investigate complaints and cancel contracts of those contractors who fail to comply.
Executive Order 11375	Lyndon B. Johnson	October 13, 1967	Amended Part I and Part II of Executive Order 11246. No substantive change.	None mentioned.
Executive Order 11478	Richard M. Nixon	August 8, 1969	Amended Part I of Executive Order 11246. Called for affirmative action programs for the federal government's supervision of Civil Service Commission.	None mentioned.

Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education: A Report

Document	Issued By Whom	Date	Major Provisions	Enforcement Power
Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972	United States Congress	March 24, 1972	I Amended Section 707 and 709 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act: (a) Effective March 24, 1974 functions of the Attorney General to be transferred to Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which can: (1) bring civil action in district court; (2) request relief-application for a charge for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order (b) Commission given authority to investigate and act on charges of a pattern or practice of discrimination. (c) Employers, employment agencies, and labor organizations are to make and preserve records relevant to the determinations of whether unlawful employment practices have been or are being committed. II Section 718 added to 1964 Civil Rights Act. No government contract can be denied, withheld, terminated, or suspended in which a contractor had an affirmative action plan unless employers has deviated substantially from that plan. Public and private educational institutions and state and local governments were covered by the act.	EEOC given power to go directly to court to enforce the law.

Affirmative Action and the Law

APPENDIX F

DOCTORATE DEGREES AWARDED IN SOUTH CAROLINA'S PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS BY DISCIPLINE, RACE, AND SEX JUNE 1977

Discipline	Public Institutions											
	Clemson *				Medical University				U. S. C.			
	Black		White		Black		White		Black		White	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Agriculture & Nat. Res.	0	0	0	1								
Biological Science	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	6
Business & Management									0	0	1	4
Education									3	7	19	22
Engineering	0	0	0	12					0	0	0	1
Letters									0	0	4	14
Mathematics	0	0	0	2					0	0	1	0
Physical Sciences	0	0	0	11					0	1	2	17
Psychology									0	0	4	10
Social Sciences									0	1	1	4
TOTALS	0	0	1	34	0	0	0	4	3	9	32	78

* Clemson did not report racial/ethnic data; therefore all figures are reported under "White," since Clemson has only 2% Black enrollment in the Total full-time enrollment, undergraduate & graduate.

Source: S. C. Commission on Higher Education

APPENDIX C

NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS AND TOTAL ENROLLMENT IN FOURTEEN STATES: FALL 1976

State	Total Enrollment	Total Number of Post-Secondary Institutions
Texas	621,155	146
Florida	345,743	73
North Carolina	248,480	116
Virginia	244,276	73
Maryland	209,513	52
Tennessee	181,346	67
Georgia	169,643	67
Alabama	156,173	56
Louisiana	154,386	31
Kentucky	128,866	38
South Carolina	121,544	56
Mississippi	97,703	45
West Virginia	80,156	28
Arkansas	67,453	29

Sources: National Center for Education Statistics, Fall Enrollment, 1976 and Education Directory, 1976-77.

APPENDIX H

AGE 15-34 POPULATION PROJECTIONS AND NUMBER OF POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS IN FOURTEEN STATES

States	15-34 Year Olds (000's)			Number of Institutions: 1976-77					
	1980	1985	1990	Public		Private		Total Public	Total Private
				4-year	2-year	4-year	2-year		
Alabama	1,294	1,243	1,172	16	20	15	5	36	20
Arkansas	720	709	713	10	6	10	3	16	13
Florida	3,015	3,447	3,754	9	28	33	3	37	36
Georgia	1,840	1,865	1,854	17	18	25	7	35	32
Kentucky	1,207	1,188	1,148	8	1	21	8	9	29
Louisiana	1,452	1,446	1,354	14	6	11	0	20	11
Maryland	1,587	1,652	1,595	13	17	20	2	30	22
Mississippi	873	851	813	9	18	12	6	27	18
North Carolina	2,031	2,055	1,996	16	57	31	12	73	43
South Carolina	1,032	1,000	970	12	20	19	5	32	24
Tennessee	1,509	1,540	1,525	11	12	38	6	23	44
Texas	4,687	4,900	4,985	36	56	49	5	92	54
Virginia	1,882	1,939	1,945	15	24	29	5	39	34
West Virginia	593	523	472	12	5	8	3	17	11

Source: Southern Regional Education Board, FACT Book on Higher Education In The South, 1977 & 1978.

APPENDIX I

TOTAL BLACK ENROLLMENT, PERCENTAGE BY LEVEL, 1976; ENROLLMENT vs. POPULATION, 1975 IN FOURTEEN STATES

STATE	TOTAL BLACK ENROLLMENT	BLACK STUDENTS PERCENTAGE BY LEVEL				PERCENT BLACK POPULATION	DIFFERENCE: ENROLLMENT % vs. POPULATION %
		Undergrad	1st Prof.	Grad.	Total		
Texas	61,147	10.6	3.5	6.3	9.8	12.5	- 2.7
North Carolina	47,392	20.8	7.9	11.4	19.1	21.9	- 2.8
Florida	39,898	12.2	3.3	8.3	11.5	14.2	- 2.7
Maryland	36,959	19.4	6.4	11.0	17.6	20.1	- 2.5
Louisiana	35,943	25.3	4.9	16.7	23.3	29.8	- 6.5
Virginia	35,841	17.0	3.9	8.5	14.7	18.7	- 4.0
Alabama	33,001	22.3	7.7	17.2	21.1	25.4	- 4.3
Georgia	30,965	19.2	7.5	14.5	18.3	26.1	- 7.8
Mississippi	29,367	31.4	4.5	25.3	30.1	35.9	- 5.8
Tennessee	26,429	15.5	12.7	9.3	14.6	15.6	- 1.0
South Carolina	25,416	23.3	4.5	12.9	20.9	30.8	- 9.9
Arkansas	10,181	16.5	4.5	8.8	15.1	16.9	- 1.8
Kentucky	9,564	8.4	2.2	3.9	7.4	7.2	+ .2
West Virginia	3,477	5.2	1.7	2.3	4.3	3.6	+ .7

Source: SREB, Fact Book on Higher Education In The South: 1975 & 1976.

APPENDIX J

HEALTH CARE CAREER PROGRAMS OFFERED IN SOUTH CAROLINA NUMBERS OF PROGRAMS AND GRADUATES, 1973-1977*

CAREER	AWARD	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS AND GRADUATES									
		Prog. 1973	Grad 1973	Prog. 1974	Grad 1974	Prog. 1975	Grad 1975	Prog. 1976	Grad 1976	Prog. 1977	Grad 1977
Chiropractor	D.C.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	114
Dental Assistant	Clinical Certificate	5	73	5	69	5	88	5	76	5	69
Dental Assistant	Associate Degree	1	20	1	22	1	18	1	27	1	21
Dental Assistant (Supervisor/ Educator)	Bachelors Degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	1	4
Dental Hygienist	Associate Degree	2	43	2	39	3	51	3	40	3	51
Dental Hygienist	Bachelors Degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	7
Dental Hygienist (Supervisor/ Educator)	Bachelors Degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	2	1	2
Dentist	D.N.D.	1	63	1	53	1	51	1	50	1	53
Dentist (Specialist)	Residency Certificate	1	2	1	2	5	8	6	10	6	12
Diet Therapist	Associate Degree	1	14	1	5	2	5	1	0	1	0
Registered Dietitian	Bachelors Degree	2	29	2	30	2	22	2	29	2	3
Registered Dietitian, Intern	Internship Certificate	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	2
Nutritionist	Masters Degree	2	1	2	1	2	9	2	6	2	22
Operating Room Technician	Clinical Certificate	6	62	7	66	7	85	7	76	7	71
Medication Technician	Clinical Certificate	1	5	1	7	1	8	1	7	1	11
Extracorporeal Circulatory Technician	Associate Degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	3	1	5
Medical Assistant	Associate Degree	2	26	2	26	2	17	2	19	2	25
Physicians Assistant	Advanced Clinical Cert.	1	16	1	29	1	40	1	47	1	24
Human Services Technician	Associate Degree	3	42	4	80	4	68	4	117	5	118
Music Therapist	Bachelors Degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	4	1	2
Social Worker	Bachelors Degree	1	21	1	35	1	41	2	45	3	31
Social Worker	Masters Degree	1	31	1	38	1	52	1	60	1	57
Rehabilitation Counselor	Masters Degree	2	51	2	69	2	71	2	73	2	56
Rehabilitation Counselor	Educational Specialist	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
Therapeutic Recreation Spec.	Bachelors Degree	1	6	1	14	2	25	2	33	2	31
Therapeutic Recreation Spec.	Masters Degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	1	3
Clinical Psychologist	Internship Certificate	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5
Clinical Psychologist	Ph.D.	1	7	1	5	1	11	1	11	1	12
Physician	M.D.	1	122	1	134	1	148	1	161	1	141
Physician	Internship Certificate	7	44	7	64	7	64	7	63	10	62
Physician--Specialist	Residency Certificate	29	65	30	91	31	110	31	125	32	144
Licensed Practical Nurse	Clinical Certificate	28	474	28	512	27	520	30	551	31	589
Registered Nurse	Associate Degree	9	287	9	391	9	458	10	497	10	519
Registered Nurse	Diploma	2	79	2	70	1	32	1	27	1	21
Registered Nurse	Bachelors Degree	3	146	3	198	3	255	3	336	3	334
Nurse Practitioner	Advanced Clinical Cert.	1	14	2	18	3	23	3	24	2	21
Nurse-Anesthetist	Advanced Clinical Cert.	2	9	2	17	2	14	3	20	3	25
Nurse-Midwife	Advanced Clinical Cert.	--	--	--	--	1	9	1	11	1	12
Nurse-Clinician/Admin/Ed	Masters Degree	2	10	3	12	5	23	6	24	6	38
Pharmacist	Bachelors Degree	2	88	2	91	2	102	2	135	2	155
Pharmacist	Residency Certificate	2	5	2	4	2	7	2	6	2	7
Pharmacist	Masters Degree	1	3	1	2	1	3	1	0	1	6
Pharmacist	Pharm. D.	--	--	--	--	1	5	1	7	1	5
Physical Therapy Assistant	Associate Degree	1	11	1	10	1	16	1	14	1	15
Physical Therapist	Bachelors Degree	--	--	--	--	1	14	1	16	1	16

APPENDIX J-Continued

HEALTH CARE CAREER PROGRAMS OFFERED IN SOUTH CAROLINA NUMBERS OF PROGRAMS AND GRADUATES, 1973-1977*

CAREER	AWARD	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS AND GRADUATES									
		Prog 1973 Grads		Prog 1974 Grads		Prog 1975 Grads		Prog 1976 Grads		Prog 1977 Grads	
Radiologic Technologist	Clinical Certificate	2	18	2	18	2	24	2	22	2	19
Radiologic Technologist	Associate Degree	7	49	7	53	7	65	7	56	8	75
Radiologic Technologist	Bachelors Degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0
Radiologic Tech. (Sup/Ed)	Bachelors Degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	2	2	3
Nuclear Medicine Technologist	Advanced Clinical Cert.	1	2	1	3	1	1	1	3	2	5
Respiratory Therapy Technician	Clinical Certificate	1	5	1	4	1	6	2	20	2	9
Respiratory Therapist	Associate Degree	3	--	3	--	3	--	--	--	3	34
Respiratory Therapist (Sup/Ed)	Bachelors Degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0	1	0
Speech Therapist	Bachelors Degree	2	40	2	41	2	39	2	32	2	36
Speech Pathology and Audiology Clinician	Masters Degree	1	7	1	14	1	4	2	20	2	35
Audiologist	Masters Degree	1	3	1	4	1	5	1	5	1	2
Speech Pathologist	Masters Degree	1	21	1	19	1	32	1	30	1	19
Ophthalmic Technician	Associate Degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	33	1	21
Optometric Technician	Associate Degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	14
Optometrist**	D. O.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	6
Animal Health Technician	Associate Degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	14
Veterinarian**	D. V. M.	2	9	2	11	2	9	2	12	2	12
Dental Laboratory Technician	Associate Degree	1	15	1	16	1	9	2	23	2	22
Environmental Systems Tech.	Associate Degree	2	24	2	21	2	14	2	12	2	11
Occupational Safety and Health Technician	Associate Degree	--	--	2	20	2	13	2	18	2	14
Occupational Safety and Health Specialist	Bachelors Degree	--	--	--	--	1	2	1	13	1	20
Environmental Spec/Engineer	Masters Degree	2	27	2	25	3	26	3	31	3	19
Bioengineer	Adv. Clin. Cert.	1	5	1	2	1	1	--	--	--	--
Bioengineer	Masters Degree	1	9	1	4	1	4	1	5	1	5
Teacher of the Deaf	Bachelors Degree	1	8	1	8	1	9	1	4	1	1
Health Educator	Bachelors Degree	1	3	1	7	1	18	1	44	1	15
Health Educator	Masters Degree	1	3	1	8	1	15	1	15	1	18
Public Health Educator	Masters Degree	--	--	--	--	1	0	1	6	1	7
Medical Unit Manager	Associate Degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	2	1	1
Health Services Administrator	Bachelors Degree	2	9	2	6	2	8	2	7	1	15
Health Services Administrator	Masters Degree	1	M	1	M	1	M	1	M	1	M
Biostatistician	Masters Degree	1	2	1	1	1	7	2	6	2	5
Public Health Administrator	Masters Degree	--	--	--	--	1	0	1	8	1	20
Epidemiologist	Masters Degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0
Certified Laboratory Assistant	Clinical Certificate	1	3	1	5	--	--	--	--	--	--
Histologic Technician	Clinical Certificate	1	7	1	7	1	4	1	6	1	7
Histotechnologist	Associate Degree	1	4	1	2	1	2	1	5	1	4
Medical Laboratory Tech.	Associate Degree	6	65	7	80	8	90	8	84	8	96
Histotechnologist (Sup/Ed)	Bachelors Degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0	1	0
Cytotechnologist	Bachelors Degree	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3
Cytotechnologist	Adv. Clinical Cert.	2	8	2	20	1	8	1	5	1	7
Medical Technologist	Bachelors Degree	13	17	13	34	15	42	15	29	11	25
Medical Technologist	Adv. Clinical Cert.	5	41	5	57	5	54	5	57	5	33

APPENDIX J-Continued

HEALTH CARE CAREER PROGRAMS OFFERED IN SOUTH CAROLINA NUMBERS OF PROGRAMS AND GRADUATES, 1973-1977*

CAREER	AWARD	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS AND GRADUATES									
		Prog 1973	Grade	Prog 1974	Grade	Prog 1975	Grade	Prog 1976	Grade	Prog 1977	Grade
Medical Record Technician	Associate Degree	1	N	1	0	—	—	1	1	1	3
Medical Record Administrator	Bachelors Degree	1	4	1	6	1	8	1	12	1	15
Anatomy	Masters Degree	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	4
Anatomy	Ph.D.	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	3	1	0
Basic and Clinical Immunology and Microbiology	Masters Degree	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	5	1	1
Basic and Clinical Immunology and Microbiology	Ph.D.	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Biochemistry	Masters Degree	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Biochemistry	Ph.D.	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	4
Bioengineering	Ph.D.	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	2
Environmental Engineering	Ph.D.	1	5	1	1	1	0	1	3	1	0
Nutrition	Ph.D.	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	1	0
Pathology	Masters Degree	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
Pathology	Ph.D.	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3	1	0
Pharmacology	Masters Degree	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Pharmacology	Ph.D.	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	0
Physiology	Masters Degree	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0
Physiology	Ph.D.	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0

* Programs have been included in this count only if graduates were contributed (or could have been contributed) to the total for the given year.

** Out-of-State programs open to S.C. students under S.R.E.B. contract, with State Financial support.

N = Missing

Source: The South Commission on Higher Education/Office of Cooperative Health Statistics Annual Surveys, with the cooperation of the State Department of Education, the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, and the South Carolina Hospital Association.

APPENDIX K

1978 OPENING FALL ENROLLMENTS BY RACE SOUTH CAROLINA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

TECHNICAL COLLEGES AND CENTERS	UNDERGRADUATE				GRADUATE				TOTAL			
	WHITE & OTHER*	BLACK	TOTAL	% BLACK	WHITE & OTHER*	BLACK	TOTAL	% BLACK	WHITE & OTHER*	BLACK	TOTAL	% BLACK
AIKEN	797	296	1,093	27.1	-	-	-	-	797	296	1,093	27.1
BEAUFORT	539	402	941	43.2	-	-	-	-	539	402	941	43.2
CHESTERFIELD-MARLBORO	364	187	551	34.0	-	-	-	-	364	187	551	34.0
DENMARK	28	537	565	95.0	-	-	-	-	28	537	565	95.0
FLORENCE-DARLINGTON	1,382	902	2,284	39.5	-	-	-	-	1,382	902	2,284	39.5
GREENVILLE	5,006	1,032	6,038	17.1	-	-	-	-	5,006	1,032	6,038	17.1
HORRY-GEORGETOWN	878	331	1,209	27.4	-	-	-	-	878	331	1,209	27.4
MIDLANDS	3,552	1,906	5,458	34.9	-	-	-	-	3,552	1,906	5,458	34.9
ORANGEBURG-CALHOUN	733	692	1,425	48.6	-	-	-	-	733	692	1,425	48.6
PIEDMONT	1,068	657	1,725	38.1	-	-	-	-	1,068	657	1,725	38.1
SPARTANBURG	1,567	294	1,861	15.8	-	-	-	-	1,567	294	1,861	15.8
SUMTER	792	623	1,415	44.0	-	-	-	-	792	623	1,415	44.0
TRI-COUNTY	2,036	336	2,372	14.2	-	-	-	-	2,036	336	2,372	14.2
TRIDENT	4,226	1,389	5,615	24.7	-	-	-	-	4,226	1,389	5,615	24.7
WILLIAMSBURG	305	236	541	43.6	-	-	-	-	305	236	541	43.6
YORK	1,093	396	1,489	26.6	-	-	-	-	1,093	396	1,489	26.6
<u>SUBTOTAL TECHNICAL COLLEGES AND CENTERS</u>	24,366	10,216	34,582	29.5					24,366	10,216	34,582	29.5
<u>SUBTOTAL PUBLIC</u>	70,337	18,020	88,357	20.3	12,200	1,564	13,764	11.4	82,537	19,584	102,121	19.2

* Includes Non-Resident Alien, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic.

Source: South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education Statistical Abstract, March 1979.

APPENDIX L
1978 OPENING FALL ENROLLMENTS BY RACE
SOUTH CAROLINA PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

	<u>UNDERGRADUATE</u>				<u>GRADUATE</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>			
	<u>WHITE & OTHER*</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>% BLACK</u>	<u>WHITE & OTHER*</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>% BLACK</u>	<u>WHITE & OTHER*</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>% BLACK</u>
<u>PRIVATE SENIOR</u>												
ALLEN UNIVERSITY	12	407	419	97.1	-	-	-	-	12	407	419	97.1
BAPTIST COLLEGE	1,727	670	2,397	28.0	-	-	-	-	1,727	670	2,397	28.0
BENEDICT COLLEGE	0	1,761	1,761	100.0	-	-	-	-	0	1,761	1,761	100.0
BOB JONES UNIVERSITY	3,986	0	3,986	0.0	495	0	495	0.0	4,481	0	4,481	0.0
CENTRAL WESLEYAN COLLEGE	365	48	413	11.6	-	-	-	-	365	48	413	11.6
CLAPLIN COLLEGE	7	845	852	99.2	-	-	-	-	7	845	852	99.2
COKER COLLEGE	268	53	321	16.5	-	-	-	-	268	53	321	16.5
COLUMBIA BIBLE COLLEGE	531	8	539	1.5	184	3	187	1.6	715	11	726	1.5
COLUMBIA COLLEGE	793	190	983	19.3	-	-	-	-	793	190	983	19.3
CONVERSE COLLEGE	721	21	742	2.8	214	7	221	3.2	935	28	963	2.9
ERSKINE COLLEGE	612	45	657	6.8	45	1	46	2.3	657	46	703	6.5
FURMAN UNIVERSITY	2,504	77	2,581	3.0	324	24	348	6.9	2,828	101	2,929	3.4
LIMESTONE COLLEGE	944	180	1,124	16.0	-	-	-	-	944	180	1,124	16.0
LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY	-	-	-	-	157	4	161	2.5	157	4	161	2.5
MORRIS COLLEGE	0	637	637	100.0	-	-	-	-	0	637	637	100.0
NEWBERRY COLLEGE	731	85	816	10.4	-	-	-	-	731	85	816	10.4
PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE	848	36	884	4.0	-	-	-	-	848	36	884	4.0
SOUTHERN METHODIST COLLEGE	59	0	59	0.0	-	-	-	-	59	0	59	0.0
VOORHEES COLLEGE	3	777	780	99.0	-	-	-	-	3	777	780	99.0
WOFFORD COLLEGE	890	91	981	9.3	-	-	-	-	890	91	981	9.3
<u>SUBTOTAL PRIVATE SENIOR</u>	<u>15,701</u>	<u>5,931</u>	<u>20,932</u>	<u>28.3</u>	<u>1,419</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>1,458</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>16,420</u>	<u>5,970</u>	<u>22,390</u>	<u>27.0</u>

* Includes Non-Resident Alien, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic.

Source: South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education Statistical Abstract, March 1979.

APPENDIX L--Continued

1978 OPENING FALL ENROLLMENTS BY RACE SOUTH CAROLINA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (Continued)

	<u>UNDERGRADUATE</u>				<u>GRADUATE</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>			
	<u>WHITE & OTHER*</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>% BLACK</u>	<u>WHITE & OTHER*</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>% BLACK</u>	<u>WHITE & OTHER*</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>% BLACK</u>
<u>PRIVATE TWO-YEAR</u>												
ANDERSON	1,068	90	1,158	7.8	-	-	-	-	1,068	90	1,158	7.8
CLINTON	0	122	122	100.0	-	-	-	-	0	122	122	100.0
FRIENDSHIP	9	157	166	94.6	-	-	-	-	9	157	166	94.6
NORTH GREENVILLE	445	117	562	20.8	-	-	-	-	445	117	562	20.8
SPARTANBURG METHODIST	863	253	1,116	22.7	-	-	-	-	863	253	1,116	22.7
<u>SUBTOTAL PRIVATE TWO-YEAR</u>	<u>2,385</u>	<u>739</u>	<u>3,124</u>	<u>23.7</u>					<u>2,385</u>	<u>739</u>	<u>3,124</u>	<u>23.7</u>
<u>SUBTOTAL PRIVATE</u>	<u>17,306</u>	<u>6,670</u>	<u>24,056</u>	<u>27.7</u>	<u>1,419</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>1,458</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>18,805</u>	<u>6,709</u>	<u>25,514</u>	<u>26.3</u>
 <u>GRAND TOTAL, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE</u>	 <u>87,723</u>	 <u>24,690</u>	 <u>112,413</u>	 <u>21.9</u>	 <u>13,619</u>	 <u>1,603</u>	 <u>15,222</u>	 <u>10.5</u>	 <u>101,342</u>	 <u>26,293</u>	 <u>127,635</u>	 <u>20.6</u>

* Includes Non-Resident Alien, American Indian, or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic.

APPENDIX M

BLACK/WHITE EMPLOYMENT AT PUBLIC TECHNICAL INSTITUTIONS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

INSTITUTIONS	FACULTY-ADM. TEACH.				FACULTY-TEACHING				FACULTY-NON-TEACHING				PROFESSIONAL NON-FACULTY			
	BLACK		WHITE		BLACK		WHITE		BLACK		WHITE		BLACK		WHITE	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Aiken			16	7	1	1	7	4				2			5	6
Beaufort	2	2	11	5	7	2	10	10				1	2	3	2	3
Chesterfield- Marlboro						3	8	7		1			2	1	3	1
Denmark	3	1			14	7	4		1		2		5	3	2	1
Florence- Darlington			19	6	3	3	28	30		1		2	4	1	12	4
Greenville	1	1	22	21	5	4	61	54		1	2	3	8	9	11	20
Horry/Georgetown			3	1		1	29	17					3		8	6
Midlands	1	1	32	16	6	9	80	67	7	5	25	17	7	5	3	17
Orangeburg/ Calhoun	1		3	1		5	27	18		3		1	2	1	5	5
SUBTOTAL - Page 1	8	5	106	57	36	35	254	207	8	11	29	26	33	23	51	63

APPENDIX M-Continued

BLACK/WHITE EMPLOYMENT AT PUBLIC TECHNICAL INSTITUTIONS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

INSTITUTIONS	FACULTY-ADM. TEACH.				FACULTY-TEACHING				FACULTY-NON-TEACHING				PROFESSIONAL NON-FACULTY			
	BLACK		WHITE		BLACK		WHITE		BLACK		WHITE		BLACK		WHITE	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Piedmont			16	3	2	2	17	10			3	1	1	2	10	8
Spartanburg			3	2		5	42	22			2		2	2	5	7
Sumter			3	1		1	22	12					2		5	5
Tri-County	2		24	7	2	2	25	13			1	1	2	2	13	13
Trident	1		20	4	4	6	57	36		1	2	11	4		32	17
Williamsburg			19	6	3	3	28	30		1		2	11	4	12	10
York			9	6	1	2	20	19			2			1	4	1
SUBTOTAL - Page 2	3		94	29	12	21	211	142		2	10	15	22	11	81	61
SUBTOTAL - Page 1	0	5	106	57	36	35	254	207	8	11	29	26	33	23	51	63
TOTALS	11	5	200	86	48	56	465	349	8	13	39	41	55	34	132	124

APPENDIX N

1978-79 APPROPRIATIONS FOR CURRENT OPERATIONS: SOUTH CAROLINA SENIOR PUBLIC COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES

(Including Fringe Benefits)

Institution	Appropriated 1978-79	Appropriated 1977-78	Difference 1978-79: 1977-78
University of South Carolina	\$61,989,646.00	\$55,950,100.00	\$ + 6,039,546.00
Medical University of South Carolina	54,419,179.00	49,922,185.00	+ 4,496,994.00
Clemson University (Educ. & General)	33,055,848.00	29,446,587.00	+ 3,609,261.00
South Carolina State College	8,823,273.00	8,679,751.00	+ 143,522.00
College of Charleston	8,790,861.00	8,684,307.00	+ 106,554.00
Winthrop College	7,991,544.00	7,831,406.00	+ 160,138.00
Citadel	6,910,002.00	6,929,791.00	- 19,789.00
Francis Marion	4,463,324.00	4,300,621.00	+ 162,703.00
USC - Spartanburg	3,587,292.00	2,578,074.00	+ 1,009,218.00
Lander	3,205,605.00	3,163,615.00	+ 41,990.00
USC - Coastal Carolina	2,770,456.00	2,331,833.00	+ 438,623.00
USC - Aiken	2,612,511.00	1,881,674.00	+ 730,837.00
TOTALS	\$198,619,541.00	\$181,699,944.00	

Increase \$16,949,597.00 = 9.3%

Source: South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, Annual Report, 1979.

APPENDIX O

SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS: EXPENDITURES, SOUTH
CAROLINA SENIOR PUBLIC COLLEGES AND
UNIVERSITIES, 1976-77

Institution	Expenditure: Scholarships & Fellowships	% of Educational & General Expenditures
University of S.C.	\$ 1,076,111	2%
Citadel	942,079	11%
Clemson	802,693	2%
S. C. State	487,221	5%
College of Charleston	199,969	2%
Winthrop	134,814	2%
Francis Marion	108,276	2%
Medical University	59,085	.02%
USC - Coastal	50,441	2%
USC - Spartanburg	19,932	1%
USC - Aiken	7,915	.03%
Lander	-0-	-0-

TOTAL:

\$ 3,888,536Source: S. C. Commission on Higher Education, Annual Report, 1979.

APPENDIX P

THE SCOPE AND IMPACT OF SELECTED FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Enhancing educational opportunity is a theme which runs through many of the descriptions of the current Federal programs intended to increase access to higher education. These Federal programs in many instances are geared to students from low-income families who without such opportunities might not be able to participate. The success of these programs is predicated on sound state efforts. However, the focus in this part is not to analyze state efforts but those emanating from the Federal government. The programs described are limited primarily to those within the purview of the U. S. Office of Education and directly or indirectly related to the issue of access. The health divisions of DHEW and divisions within other Federal agencies have programs intended to increase access and participation of Black students in the health sciences, engineering, physical sciences, aviation, and other selected fields. There are related programs which have been initiated at the state level and in the private sector. Due to the limitations of time, this report focuses its attention on the DHEW/USOE programs. (Forthcoming reports will describe other programs existing in the Federal, state, and private sectors).

While such programs exist, constant demands are made on their funds to include not only low-income students but various other groups who are experiencing difficulties in higher education and want to benefit from the limited resources available. A large number of Black and other minority students participate in these Federal programs, not because the programs are geared toward any specific racial group but because "of their overrepresentation among [educationally or financially] 'disadvantaged' students" (Congressional Budget Office, 1977). Due to this reality and because the larger society has not alleviated this continuing deprivation, such programs will be a necessity for some time to come.

This part of the report provides an analysis of the extent to which such programs have assisted Black, minority, or low-income students to gain access to and participate more fully in higher education. There are 18 major programs reviewed in this part, some that have been in existence for ten years or more. Information on the impact of such programs on Black Americans is available to only a limited degree because data on participants were not systematically collected by specific racial/ethnic groups. Nevertheless, a number of evaluation studies have been conducted and are cited herein. Most of these findings were excerpted from the Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the U. S. Office of Education, Fiscal Year 1977.

FROM: National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities, Access of Black Americans to Higher Education: How Open Is The Door? January 1979.

The 18 ongoing programs are:

Special Programs for the Disadvantaged

Upward Bound Program

Talent Search

Educational Opportunity Centers

Special Services for Disadvantaged Students in Institutions of Higher Education

Student Financial Aid Programs

Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program

Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program

State Student Incentive Grant Program

College Work Study Program

Guaranteed Student Loan Program

National Direct Student Loan Program

Graduate and Professional Training Programs

Legal Training for the Disadvantaged

Education for the Public Service

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Program

Other Programs

State Postsecondary Education Commissions

Community Service and Continuing Education Program

Strengthening Developing Institutions

National Institute for Education

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

A. Special Programs for the Disadvantaged

These programs operate in both the secondary school and higher education settings. Overall, they are intended to recruit, counsel, and tutor "disadvantaged" students to assist these students in gaining access to and succeeding in higher education. Unlike the programs of financial aid to students, these programs are "aimed at removing non-financial barriers to access and persistence." However, only one in eight potential clients can be served based on current funding levels.

A recent study of high school completion and postsecondary education entry rates for the Upward Bound (UB) participants and a similar but nonparticipating comparison group of students indicated that while high school completion rates are basically the same (70 percent probability of graduation), large differences exist for access to higher education. In 1974, 71 percent of the UB high school graduates compared with 47 percent of the comparison group entered an institution of higher education. The study also indicates that

the likelihood of entry for UB participants increased with the length of time in the program. Preliminary results from a later study show that the higher level of attendance for UB participants is continuing. Approximately one-half of the UB participants were Black, one-half were classified as "academic risks," and 2/3 were at or below the poverty level.

The recent study of the Talent Search (TS) Program showed that it served about 109,000 clients in 1973-74 and that 80 percent (87,200) applied for postsecondary education. Of the number who applied, 65,000, or 75 percent were accepted. Of the number accepted, 12,753 enrolled in a postsecondary institution.

The Educational Opportunities Centers Program provides various forms of counseling and remedial or tutorial assistance. In its first year of operation (1973-74), 44 percent of the 32,000 participants enrolled in postsecondary schools and an additional 13 percent had been accepted but had not yet begun their studies.

These recent studies show the positive effects of these TRIO programs and also reveal a need to improve program impact to serve more students. Currently work is underway to identify and evaluate successful techniques and models. After a three year trial period, the results of these tested models will be disseminated to state and local education agencies and postsecondary educational institutions for use in their own efforts.

B. Student Financial Aid Programs

While all low-income or needy students do not require the type of assistance offered by the special programs for the disadvantaged, all require financial assistance. Participation in postsecondary study activities varies with family income level. For the high school graduates of 1974, less than 25 percent of the lowest income group (under \$5,000) attended 4-year institutions, compared with 50 percent of the highest income group (over \$30,000). There is also a higher probability that a low-income high school graduate will enroll in a vocational or technical institution than a high-income graduate. Low-income students also have a higher likelihood of failure (80 percent greater chance of not completing a postsecondary program once they have enrolled). This dropout rate is lower in 4-year institutions than in all other institutional types, regardless of income class. The higher tendency for low-income students to enroll in 2-year and vocational or technical institutions partially explains their overall higher dropout rates.

There is a continuing need for a review of the way in which aid is packaged since an education at an institution that appears to be the highest priced can turn out to be the least expensive simply because the financial aid package is more responsive (Boyd, 1978).

Most USOE student aid programs are need-based, although other Federal programs, as well as many state and institutional programs, provide grant aid on bases other than need. Without continued focus on need-based programs, limited resources will be depleted. Some of the Federal financial aid programs are cited below, with brief excerpts on research findings reported in the FY 1977 USOE Evaluation Report.

Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOG)

In 1975-76, 84 percent of the applicants who qualified for BEOG's (or 1,228,034 students) received them. The average award was \$775. In 1976-77, the average award was \$771, and the number of participants increased to 1,945,454 students. There has been an increase in the number of independent student applicants since 1973-74, and these students in 1975-76 comprised about 30 percent of the total qualifying applicants.

BEOG program data and recent results from a Higher Education Panel Survey (Atelsek and Gomberg, 1977) for 1974-75 indicate the program is generally working well. While the program serves a larger percentage of minority students, preliminary data indicate that this percentage fell from 48.1 percent in 1974-75 to 42.1 percent in 1976-77. This high percentage of minority students served goes back to their overrepresentation in the lower income groups.

The BEOG program seems to provide for a greater emphasis on access and lesser emphasis on choice since 90 percent of the BEOG students are at the lowest institutional cost levels. At the higher cost schools, although the BEOG awards are higher, they account for a lower percentage of the total cost at these institutions. Instead, at these higher cost institutions, state, local, and private scholarships are more important in equalizing financial barriers.

Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG)

Minority students received 47.8 percent of the SEOG's in 1974-75. In 1976-77, however, their participation rate declined to 39 percent. In the public sector, the largest percentage of minority SEOG recipients (48.4 percent) was in two-year institutions, and the public universities had the lowest percentage (36.5 percent) of minority recipients. The figures were reversed for the private institutions, with 37.2 percent of the minority recipients in universities and 26.6 percent in two-year institutions.

State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG)

This program is intended to encourage states to develop or expand programs of grant aid to help undergraduate students in substantial financial need. It is a 50-50 cost sharing program between the Federal and state governments. No data by racial/ethnic groups were available to assess the impact of this program on Black students.

Students with family incomes below \$6,000 comprised 36 percent of the SSIG recipients in 1975-76, compared with 43 percent of the 1974-75 recipients. On the other hand, middle-income (over \$15,000) students comprised 15 percent of the 1975-76 recipients, an increase from 1974-75 when they were 8.9 percent of the total recipients.

In 1975-76, proprietary schools accounted for 2.3 percent of the available funds compared with 1.4 percent of the 1974-75 funds. Sixty percent of the students receiving 75-76 SSIG awards were in public institutions; 39 percent were in private institutions, and one percent were in proprietary schools.

College Work Study Program (CWSP)

Minorities comprised 32.6 percent of the CWSP participants, and 38.5 percent were from families with incomes under \$7,500 in April 1975. These percentages were confirmed over a two-year period. The USOE evaluation report finds it "somewhat surprising the [CWSP's] impact on minority and low-income students is substantially less than that of the Basic and Supplemental Grants programs" since the CWSP program is also designed to benefit students in great financial need.

Guaranteed Student Loan Program (GSLP)

The income eligibility requirement for this program was deleted by Congress in 1978, enabling any student to be eligible for this program. Other changes have resulted for graduate and professional school students which enables them to borrow a higher cumulative total.

In FY 1975, 11.6 percent of these Federally Insured Student Loans were disbursed to Black students. Twenty-three percent of all borrowers were from families with adjusted incomes less than \$3,000, and an additional 24.4 percent were from families with incomes between \$3,000 and \$6,000. Students with adjusted family incomes over \$15,000 accounted for 2.5 percent of the recipients. The average age of borrowers has been increasing as proprietary schools participate more intensively in the program.

This program has been plagued with an increase in default rates in recent years. This increase has been primarily due to high defaults among borrowers attending proprietary (vocational) institutions.

A report on a Survey of Commercial Lenders in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program, completed in December 1975 by RMC Research Corporation, found that student access to loans is not as broad as had generally been believed. Over 70 percent of the lenders state that, for the student or his/her parents, having a prior account with the lender was a "very important" consideration in the making of the loan. Almost 53 percent said they always checked the family's credit record.

The use of these checks may indicate a basis for restricting loans to some students despite the existence of the guarantee of repayment by the Federal Government. For low-income Black students, these checks could have a definite negative impact if bank accounts have not been established. Many low-income Blacks pay bills with money orders or cash and have nothing left, after expenses, to maintain a bank account. In addition, no credit has been afforded them to establish the type of credit record which a bank would consider.

A June 1976 study by the Systems Group, Inc. showed that participation by proprietary schools acting as direct lenders increased from 18.6 percent of all loans in FY 1972 to 25.3 percent in FY 1974. Borrowers at these same institutions were shown in the earlier study to have significantly higher than average default rates.

National Direct Student Loan Program (NDSL)

Less than 30 percent of all borrowers under this program in FY 1976 were from minority or ethnic groups. Twenty-two percent were independent students and 7.8 percent were likely to be in graduate school. Students with approximate parental incomes under \$15,000 utilize NDSL loans more heavily while larger Guaranteed Student Loan utilization is the case for those with family incomes above \$15,000.

C. Graduate and Professional Training Programs

There are two major ongoing programs under this category: Legal Training for the Disadvantaged, and Education for the Public Service. In addition, there is a newly-created program to enhance access to graduate and professional schools.

Legal Training for the Disadvantaged

This program, commonly referred to as CLEO, makes grants available to public and private agencies and institutions for the purpose of assisting disadvantaged persons to undertake training in the legal professions. The Council for Legal Education Opportunity (CLEO) was established for the purpose of bringing about a significant increase in the number of lawyers from minority and disadvantaged groups. In 1976-77, CLEO funded 359 continuation fellowships and 200 new fellowships.

Between 1978 and 1976, 2,219 persons successfully completed the CLEO summer pre-law preparation program, and 2,013, or 91 percent, entered law school. Of the number of students enrolled in law school, 929, or 46 percent, graduated.

Education for the Public Service

This program's goal is to expand and improve the training of persons for the public service. Some of the funds go directly to the institutions to improve and strengthen their programs, the remainder goes toward fellowship awards for graduate and professional students who plan to pursue a career in the public service. In FY 1975, 263 fellows and 80 colleges benefited from the program, and in FY 1976, 344 fellows and 73 colleges participated.

The success of this program and its impact on minority students is not ascertainable at this time since no evaluation efforts have been conducted.

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Program (GPOP)

This is a new program intended to assist colleges and universities in the identification and recruitment of candidates, and the provision of fellowship assistance to students from groups traditionally underrepresented in graduate and professional studies, minorities and

women in particular. Each fellow receives a stipend of \$3,900 for a 12-month year. The institution also receives \$3,900 to cover the cost of tuition and regular fees. Colleges and universities can apply for institutional aid designed to help finance student recruitment, special orientation programs, and counseling and other support services.

Preliminary data on awards for the 1978-79 academic year show the following sex and ethnic/racial breakdown for the 354 fellowships, based on 90 percent of the institutions responding.

<u>Racial/Ethnic Group</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Black	18.0	26.5	44.6
White	25.0	1.2	26.2
Hispanic American	5.7	11.1	16.9
Asian American	3.6	4.5	8.1
Native American	2.7	1.5	4.2

Of the fellowships, 22 or 6.2 percent, went unused in 1978-79. The following institutions had one or more fellowships that were not awarded: University of Colorado (1 of 8), Illinois Institute of Technology (1 of 7), University of Notre Dame (1 of 8), University of Iowa (2 of 7), University of Minnesota (1 of 11), University of Montana (5 of 8), Bowling Green State University (1 of 9), Ohio State University (1 of 6), Wright State University (1 of 5), University of Oklahoma (1 of 9), University of Pittsburgh (3 of 5), Clemson University (2 of 2), University of Virginia (1 of 10), University of Wisconsin-Madison (1 of 8).

Five Black colleges participated in the 1978-79 program. Two received only student fellowship grants while the other three received both fellowship and institutional grants. There were 34 HBC's that were eligible to apply under GPOP criteria requiring that participating institutions offer a masters or higher degree. In the universe of higher education institutions, 1,100 institutions are eligible under these criteria. If the goal of this program is to achieve increased representation of minorities in graduate/professional programs and selected fields, a higher rate of participation by the HBC's will be necessary, not only in GPOP, but in all Title IX programs. Table 15 provides data on the grants awarded to HBC's in 1978-79.

There are 3 sets of criteria used by the proposal readers to rate proposals and determine the allocation of funds. The criteria for awarding fellowship allocations include a significant number of points (25) for the institution's commitment to serving those minority students which have been traditionally underrepresented in colleges and universities and academic and professional career fields. In the institutional grants criteria, there are 20 points allowed for the extent to which the project proposes activities which would assist in serving persons with varied backgrounds and experiences including, but not limited to, members of minority groups.

A third set of criteria evaluates the program area(s). Again, 20 points are allowed for the provision of evidence which demonstrates that one or more minority groups, which the institution proposes to serve, have been traditionally underrepresented in the proposed graduate or professional study area. The program also requires geographical representation.

It should be noted, however, that in all three sets of criteria, the term minority includes women as an underrepresented group, which partially accounts for the high percentage of whites involved in the program. At the University of Colorado (85.7 percent), Georgia Institute of Technology (63.6 percent), Northern Illinois University (50 percent), University of Iowa (100 percent), St. Louis University (66.7 percent), Rutgers University (66.7 percent), University of New Mexico (50 percent), Columbia University - College of Physicians and Surgeons (50 percent), Carnegie Mellon University (85.7 percent), Brown University (60 percent), and Rice University (100 percent), one-half or more of the fellowships awarded went to whites, mostly women.

D. Other Programs

The following programs, while not intended to directly assist students seeking access to institutions of higher learning, include elements that bear significantly on the participation of Black students in higher education.

State Postsecondary Education Commission

The goal of this program is to encourage improved statewide coordination of higher education planning and functions. The impact of this goal on students is seen in some of the specific program objectives: allowing all desirous persons within the state an opportunity to benefit from postsecondary education through better coordination, expansion, and alteration of existing public and private educational resources; and promoting interstate cooperative projects to increase the access to postsecondary opportunities for residents of the participating states.

Community Service and Continuing Education Program

This program essentially encourages the higher education institution to modify its traditional mission in order to provide specially designated educational services convenient for adult participation. While not specifically impacting the traditional college-going population, it can provide postsecondary and other continuing education opportunities to those persons who are not prepared to enroll in a traditional college curriculum. Operational projects in FY 1976 provided continuing education for 405,000 adults.

Strengthening Developing Institutions (Title III)

This program is important to mention in a discussion of access to higher education for Black Americans since many of the institutions assisted by this program enroll large numbers of low-income and minority students. Support of these institutions indirectly supports the ability of a growing number of students to participate in postsecondary

education and provides for the delivery of better services and an educational environment conducive to participation by Blacks.

The original legislative hearings for the HEA, Title III program focused on a subset of predominantly Black colleges as the target group. These schools have and continue to enroll a significant proportion of Black students in traditional higher education. However, since its inception, the program has included institutions in which 50 percent or more of the enrollment came from low-income families, as well as representatives of minority populations.

In recent years, because of a legislative set-aside, two-year institutions have accounted for 24 percent of the total funding awarded. The demands on this program are great, and the desire of various types of institutions to participate will no doubt become evident in the upcoming hearings on the reauthorization of the program.

Despite the fact that this is an institutional support program, a number of the activities funded will result in improved services and educational opportunities for students who enroll in Title III institutions.

National Institute of Education (NIE)

NIE is the Federal Government's major research and development effort related to national directions in education. An example of an NIE program which can impact on some of the problems identified throughout this paper is the Equity Research Group. This effort is a positive first step which must be followed up by a systematic plan.

A recent publication entitled *Improving Equity in Postsecondary Education - New Directions for Leadership* (Gappa, 1977), reports on an Equity Workshop sponsored by NIE. This report points up the current status of equity within postsecondary education as viewed by the workshop participants and sets forth some future directions. The new directions for research included, as a top priority, increasing the participation of women and minorities in educational research. "Such participation is essential in choosing research topics and interpreting data." Yet these proposals and others recognize the need for further input to the U. S. Census Bureau and the National Center for Education Statistics aiming at a less piecemeal and more holistic approach to solving the problem of defining and evaluating equity goals and implementation efforts. There is recent involvement by NIE in addressing these and other concerns. A key part of this process is an ongoing relationships with groups which have historically been addressing themselves to some of these issues and already have laid some groundwork for these new directions.

Through the direct efforts of NIE and other federally-supported regional research centers, these new research proposals regarding access to and opportunities for Black Americans in postsecondary education could become a reality now that broad agreement on the fundamental questions has been reached. The placement of Blacks in specific policymaking positions within NIE can only serve to increase its sensitivity to the issues.

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE)

FIPSE has flexible guidelines and requirements which have allowed it to reach both Black institutions and numerous community-based organizations primarily intended to serve a predominantly Black population. Most of the minority projects have been under the Fund's "Comprehensive" program entitled "Alternatives to the Revolving Door: Effective Learning for Low Achieving Students," which is geared toward improving services to "persons not adequately served by the system." Of the \$55 million in grants awarded since 1973, 4.5 percent were awarded for projects directly impacting Black colleges. An additional 1.8 percent was awarded to community-based institutions mainly intended to serve a predominantly Black population.

E. Successes and Pitfalls

This part of the report has provided descriptions of various USOE programs intended to equalize educational opportunities. As the narrative shows, there are some need-based programs that have been successful and have served large numbers of Black students primarily because Blacks are overrepresented among low-income families.

Of the special programs for the disadvantaged (TRIO), the most successful (according to the evaluations conducted) has been the Upward Bound Program. Students who have participated in this program (and especially for longer periods of time) have a much higher likelihood of going on to college than those that did not. The students seemed to have benefited from the counseling and tutorial assistance they received and were, therefore, better informed about what would be expected and required of them with respect to enrollment and success in higher education.

Participation in the UB program resulted in better and larger offers of financial aid for the students. In addition, UB participants were more likely to enter 4-year colleges or universities than were nonparticipants, and they generally had higher educational expectations as well. This program would seem worthy of increased consideration, funding, and expansion to reach more youth at earlier ages.

The Educational Opportunities Centers Program showed 44 percent of its clients enrolling in postsecondary education. These TRIO programs must be viewed as a "package" effort designed to support student access and success. Improved coordination of not only these programs but others could better assured that they are compatible and working in a maximally effective way to deliver the required services.

The programs of financial aid to students have been successful and have aided in the recent upsurge of Black enrollment. However, different programs have different effects stemming from the administration of the aid programs and the extent to which institutions or other entities are committed to Black students. While aid programs have been cited as being responsible for a larger number of Blacks enrolling in college, there are significant areas which cause concern, among them the push by more middle and upper income families to obtain a "piece of the pie."

This concern is not unfounded since in both the BEOG and the SEOG programs, between FY 1975 and FY 1977, the percentage of minorities receiving awards dropped from 48 percent to 42 percent for BEOGs and from 48 percent to 39 percent for SEOGs.

Despite those drops, the Federal aid programs have served to enhance access for Blacks because they were designed to serve low-income students. These programs must continue this emphasis through regulations and funding levels which meet the current and future needs. The passage of the Middle Income Student Assistance Act in 1978, which broadens eligibility for selected student financial aid programs, will no doubt cause a diminishing of the number and proportion of low-income or minority recipients, even though the maximum award will increase.

The BEOG program increases access but does little for student choice of institution. Because of increasing costs and the half cost/maximum provision of the BEOG program, most students find themselves at low-cost, less prestigious institutions. The growth of the BEOGs seems to have encouraged the growth of proprietary (profit-making) vocational institutions. This trend must be further studied to develop strong and effective tools for differentiating between legitimate programs and rip-offs occurring in proprietary schools serving large numbers of students who qualify for BEOGs, particularly Black students.

At the higher cost institutions, state, local, and private scholarships were cited as being more important in addressing financial barriers to access. Given that fact, and looking at the distribution of Blacks versus majority students by type of institution, there seems to be a need to push for equality of financial aid disbursements at those levels.

The Federal grant programs by themselves do not cover the full amount required by students to attend college. However, the manner in which the balance is met requires attention. College Work Study did not impact minority and low-income students at the same rate as the grant programs (only 33 percent of CWSP students are minority). The reasons for this require further study. It may well be that decisions are made to alleviate the difficulties associated with working and studying by finding other sources of financial aid. National Direct Student Loans are used more often than Guaranteed Student Loans by lower income students. One reason is more than likely attributable to bank/lending practices which discourage low-income borrowers and which have been carried over into Federally insured programs.

There are two programs especially geared toward increasing opportunities for minorities in graduate and professional programs. Although there are other programs within which Black students and/or institutions can participate, they do not have minorities as a specific focus. The CLEO (law school) program has been in existence for some time and over an eight year period provided assistance to approximately 2,200 students, almost half of whom graduated from law school.

The newest program, GPOP, is intended to increase the enrollment of minorities (including women) in areas where there is currently an underrepresentation. These areas of

underrepresentation have not yet been identified on a national level, however, and the focus is currently on those areas determined by the participating institutions. Only five historically Black colleges received awards in 1978-79 although 34 have some type of master's or higher degree program and are therefore eligible. This program could be successful, however, given the role of the HBC's in enrolling and graduating Black students, efforts must be made to assure increased participation of these colleges in the GPOP program. Since many of those who would be eligible to enroll in graduate or professional schools may also have dependents for whom they must care and the current \$3,900 stipend is less than adequate, additional funds must be allocated to provide for larger fellowships. Further, there is a continuing trend of trying to solve the problems associated with a specific minority group by broadening the field and including too many other groups. This makes the potential solutions almost impossible to attain.

F. New Directions

There is another area which must be carefully studied to assess the nature of its potential impact on Black students. Historically, vocational education programs meant that Black students were relegated to industrial arts/home economics and other vocational curricula most often leading to dead-end jobs considered undesirable by most other people. Recently, however, a number of vocational and technical education curricula, particularly in the secondary schools, have come to represent stepping stones to careers in the engineering, physical sciences, and allied health fields. Certain forms of vocational-technical education may in fact provide viable means of increasing the access of Blacks to fields in which there has traditionally been underrepresentation.

Title IV - Part F of the Education Amendments of 1978, "Special Projects in the Biomedical Sciences. . .," is a five-year program which will counsel, motivate, and strengthen the academic preparation of economically disadvantaged secondary school students in order to encourage them to pursue careers in biomedical science fields. Although this program is geared to those specific fields, this type of early effort could prove useful in a number of other areas in which Blacks are seriously underrepresented.

APPENDIX Q

IN PARTIAL RESPONSE TO THE JULY 3, 1979, REQUEST FROM OCR FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

The composition of the Commission and its forerunner, the State Advisory Commission on Higher Education, 1962-1979, was as follows:

- a) Composition by race and sex of the South Carolina State Advisory Commission on Higher Education, 1962-1967.¹

	<u>Name</u> ³	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>62-63</u>	<u>63-64</u>	<u>64-65</u>	<u>65-66</u>	<u>66-67</u>	<u>Total Yrs. Served</u>
1.	Blair, Robert C. ²	M	W				X	X	2
2.	Cauthen, John K.	M	W				X	X	2
3.	Furman, Alester	M	W				X	X	2
4.	Lumpkin, John H.	M	W				X	X	2
5.	Russell, Robert B.	M	W				X	X	2
6.	Vance, Robert M.	M	W				X	X	2
7.	Wall, Craig E.	M	W				X	X	2

¹All members of the State Advisory Commission on Higher Education were appointed by the Governor. We have no information to indicate that any funds were appropriated to the Advisory Commission or that any appointments were made to the Commission prior to 1965.

²Each member of the Advisory Commission was a Governor's appointee to the 1967 Commission on Higher Education except Mr. Robert C. Blair.

³Source: Information on State Advisory Commission members was obtained from Dr. Frank E. Kinard, Assistant Director for Programs and Research, South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. (Dr. Kinard served as the first Executive Director of the Commission on Higher Education in 1967-68.)

b) Ex-officio (Representatives of Institutional Boards¹) Members of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (1967-1978).

	<u>Name³</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>67-68</u>	<u>68-69</u>	<u>69-70</u>	<u>70-71</u>	<u>71-72</u>	<u>72-73</u>	<u>73-74</u>	<u>74-75</u>	<u>75-76</u>	<u>76-77</u>	<u>77-78</u>	<u>Total Yrs. Served</u>
1.	Coker, Robert E.	M	W	X	X	X									3
2.	Grier, William H.	M	W	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					7
3.	Osborne, Rutledge L.	M	W	X	X	X									3
4.	Pollock, E. A.	M	W	X											1
5.	Schachte, Edwin J., Jr.	M	W	X	X	X	X								4
6.	White, Bruce W.	M	W	X											1
7.	Holliday, J. H. J.	M	W		X	X	X	X	X	X					6
8.	Rogers, J. A.	M	W		X	X	X	X	X						5
9.	Stanback, I. P.	M	B			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
10.	Lightsey, E. Oswald	M	W				X								1
11.	Marchant, T. Eston	M	W				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8
12.	Peebles, Harrison L.	M	W					X	X	X					3
13.	Quattlebaum, Alex M. ²	M	W						X	X					2
14.	Scarborough, Y. W., Jr.	M	W						X	X	X	X	X	X	6
15.	Johnson, Mitchell	M	W							X	X	X	X	X	5
16.	Burns, Howard L.	M	W							X	X	X	X	X	5
17.	Driffin, William C.	M	W								X	X			2
18.	Jennings, Larkin H.	M	W								X				1
19.	McAlister, Paul W.	M	W								X	X	X	X	4
20.	Prioleau, William F., Jr.	M	W									X	X	X	3
21.	Pratt, John M.	M	W										X	X	2

¹The Act 194 of the 1967 South Carolina General Assembly designated the chairman of the board, or a representative from the board appointed by the chairman of each state-supported institution of higher learning, as ex-officio members of the Commission.

²Mr. Alex M. Quattlebaum also served as a Governor's appointee from 1974-75 through 1977-78.

³Source: Records of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education.

c) Appointed Members of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (1967-1979)¹

Name	Sex	Race	67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77	77-78	78-79	Total Yrs. Served	Current Term Expires
1. Cauthen, John K. ²	M	W	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						7	
2. Furman, Alester G. ²	M	W	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						7	
3. Lumpkin, John H. ²	M	W	X	X	X	X									4	
4. Russell, Robert B. ²	M	W	X	X	X	X									4	
5. Vance, Robert M. ²	M	W	X	X	X	X									4	
6. Wall, Craig E. ²	M	W	X	X	X	X	X								5	
7. Walsh, T. Emmet	M	W	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		11	
8. Chatman, Hugh M.	M	W					X	X	X	X					4	
9. Smith, Cathcart R.	M	W					X	X	X	X	X	X	X		7	
10. Sheheen, Fred R.	M	W					X	X	X	X					4	
11. Howe, Gedney M., Jr.	M	W						X	X	X	X	X			5	
12. Wlenges, Othniel	M	W						X	X	X					3	
13. Davis, Marianna	F	B						X	X	X	X				4	
14. Smith, O. Stanley	M	W							X	X					2	
15. Quattlebaum, Alex M. ³	M	W								X	X	X	X		4	
16. Colvin, M. Calhoun	M	W									X	X			2	
17. Forbes, Wanda L.	F	W									X	X	X		3	
18. Shirley, J. Clyde	M	W									X	X	X	X	4	1982
19. Clement, Arthur J. H., Jr.	M	B										X	X	X	3	1980
20. Swanson, Arthur M.	M	W										X	X	X	3	1982
21. Hawk, Nancy D.	F	W											X		1	
22. Gallagher, R. C.	M	W												X	1	1982
23. Bostic, James E.	M	B												X	1	1980
24. Cooper, B. J.	M	B												X	1	1980
25. Dreher, Jennie C.	F	W												X	1	1980
26. Gilliam, Roosevelt, Jr.	M	B												X	1	1980

to. 4

c) Continued

Name	Sex	Race	67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77	77-78	78-79	Total Yrs. Served	Current Term Expires
27. Graham, Robert E.	M	W												X	1	1982
28. Harris, Hugh P.	M	W												X	1	1982
29. Rogers, Joseph O., Jr.	M	W												X	1	1982
30. Timmerman, Robert P. ⁴	M	W												---	---	---
31. Rudnick, Irene K. ⁵	F	W												---	---	1980
32. Taylor, C. Otis	M	W												X	1	1982
33. Wells, Margaret E.	F	W												X	1	1982
34. Wilkins, Robert P.	M	W												X	1	1980
35. Williams, Robert F.	M	W												X	1	1980
36. Wright, Louis D.	M	W												X	1	1980

¹From 1967-68 through 1977-78 the Governor appointed members to the Commission under the provisions of Act 194, 1967. Under the provisions of Act 410, 1978 the Governor appointed twelve (12) members (two from each of the six Congressional Districts) to the Commission with the advice and consent of a majority of the Legislative Delegation from the respective Congressional Districts. The Governor also appointed six (6) members to the Commission upon the recommendation of the majority of the respective Legislative Delegation.

²Previously served two (2) years as Governor appointees to the State Advisory Commission on Higher Education (1968-1969).

³Previously served as an institutional representative on the Commission (1972-1974).

⁴Mr. Timmerman was appointed in 1978 under the provisions of Act 410, but found it impossible to serve. He resigned from the Commission in November, 1978.

⁵Ms. Rudnick was appointed in April, 1979, to complete the unexpired portion of Mr. Timmerman's term.

APPENDIX R

Favorable Job Outlook and Black Underrepresentation, Southern Region, 1980

	Total Projected Average Annual Openings, 1975-80 For College Graduates	Southern Region Total Projected Annual Market- Ready College Graduates, 1980	Black Projected Market-Ready Annual College Graduates 1980
Engineering	10,900-11,500	11,800	500-550
Accounting	5,700- 6,900	6,650	550-600
Library Science	2,400- 2,600	1,500-1,900	100-150
Computer Sciences	2,800- 3,200	1,100	70-100
Urban and Regional Planning	200- 300	200	*
Medical Laboratory Technology	2,100- 2,500	2,000	150-200
Hospital and Health Care Administration	1,200- 1,500	500	*
Nursing	4,200- 5,400	4,900	350-400
Dentistry	1,500- 1,690	1,400	55- 60
Medical and Osteopathy	4,100- 5,500	4,000	200-250
Veterinary Medicine	750- 800	650	*
Optometry	200- 300	300	NA
Occupational and Physical Therapy	1,500- 2,000	500	*
Dental Hygiene	200- 300	300	*
Medical Record Librarianship	300	100	*

*Less than 50

Source: Galambos, Eva C., *Black College Graduates and the Job Market in the South, 1980*, SREB, 1978.

APPENDIX S

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND HIGHLIGHTS*

The theme of the Committee's First Annual Report - "The Crisis of Appearance Versus Reality" - is extended to this examination of the access of Black Americans to higher education. The proportion of Blacks enrolled at the undergraduate level is increasing although it has yet to reach parity with the Black proportion of the general population. This Committee report takes the view that left along and not persistently forged or constantly defined the potential progress of Black Americans in higher education will be adversely affected. Cyclical periods of inattention and resistance to the advancement of Black Americans are the rule rather than the exception.

A common theme heard these days suggests it is impossible to stop or reverse Black progress in higher education. The hard evidence from medical schools and law schools indicates otherwise. Despite a general impression that substantial increases were being made in law and medical school admissions throughout the early 1970s, the increases peaked in 1971. A consistent decline from that point has resulted in an absolute reduction of 173 in the number of Black first year law school students and of 21 in the number of Black first year medical school students from 1977 to 1978. This is clearly a case of the reversal of progress. Emphasizing the areas of weakness as well as strengths in Black progress will hopefully serve as an early warning system and avoid further reversal of progress in other sectors of higher education.

Reports of progress by Blacks in terms of higher education opportunities fail to examine the circumstances under which the approximately one million Black students participate in higher education. Very little data have been available to illuminate the quality of participation and rates of retention and graduation.

To view total enrollment gains in isolation from the quality of participation and the end product - college graduation - is dangerous. In Fall 1972, Black students comprised 8.4 percent of the full-time undergraduate enrollment in the United States; four years later, 6.4 percent of the baccalaureate degrees conferred went to Black students.

It is evident that the rates of access and of graduation decline as the level of training rises. Blacks represented 10.2 percent of the undergraduate enrollment but only 6 percent of the graduate school and 4.5 percent of the professional school enrollment in Fall 1976. Associate degrees and other less than four-year graduation awards to Blacks comprised 8.4 percent; while doctorates awarded to Blacks represented 3.6 percent of the total degrees awarded in 1975-76.

The quality of participation and end results are critical in measuring access as a potential for ultimate graduation. The Committee amplifies the following:

* This section is taken from the Report of the National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education.

Postsecondary education access issues should realistically include an assessment of the total educational system, as well as a history of the educational experiences of Blacks in the United States.

While this report examines one sector of Federal programs designed to respond to the access needs of low-income minority youth, additional examination is needed of other Federal, state and local government, and private programs.

The historically Black colleges, as a group, have long responded to the educational needs of Black Americans; therefore the Committee has examined the current national access picture separately from that of historically Black colleges.

Black enrollment in higher education must be analyzed by type of institution and major fields to derive a clearer picture of participation and definition of equity.

A significant number of Black elementary and secondary school students do not make it to high school graduation as solid college candidates. Early intervention may produce better results than waiting for remediation at the college level. Some variables of particular importance are:

In 1977, Black dropouts between 18-24 years of age exceeded Black college enrollees.

Black students at the secondary school level are suspended more than three times as often as white students and for longer periods of time.

Healthy scholastic development of Blacks is still hampered by discrimination in special education placement and tracking.

Black students generally receive inadequate counseling and poor secondary school preparation.

Black students themselves cite a lack of encouragement (from school officials) to participate in college preparatory programs with a resultant automatic channeling into trade schools or community colleges.

The new competency testing movement will likely be another barrier to full Black participation in higher education unless the present emphasis is shifted from detailing of student inadequacies to improving the student's learning experience.

A growing number of Black students continue to pursue some form of postsecondary education, despite barriers. The quality of that participation deserves assessment. The status of Black student involvement in higher education is revealed by data gathered in the Fall of 1977:

Over one million Black students (9.3 percent of the total higher education enrollment) were pursuing some form of higher education.

Almost half of the Black first-time freshmen were from families with incomes of \$8,000 or less, compared with 7 percent of white freshmen.

Approximately 42 percent of all Blacks enrolled at all levels of higher education were in two-year/community colleges, compared with about 1/3 of all white students enrolled.

Forty-five percent of all Black undergraduates were in two-year colleges as were 55 percent of all Black first-time freshmen.

Fifteen percent of the Black students in higher education were enrolled at the university level compared with 27 percent of the white students.

Thirty percent of all Blacks in higher education were in colleges where they represented the majority (18 percent in the historically Black colleges [HBC's] and 12 percent in the newer predominantly Black colleges [NPBC's]), which have generally been established in areas of large minority/Black population.

Eighty percent of the Blacks in the NPBC's were in two-year/community colleges.

Blacks continue to be seriously underrepresented in physical sciences and engineering fields at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Historical shortage of Black manpower in technical and scientific fields requires surpassing parity with whites to make up for lost time.

At the graduate level, Blacks are more likely than the average student to be enrolled part-time, suggesting the burdening necessity to combine study with work more often than other students.

Of the 65,000 Black graduate students, 63.4 percent were in their first year of graduate study.

Nineteen percent of Black students pursuing professional programs were in the historically Black colleges.

At the doctorate level, more than three times as many degrees were conferred to non-resident aliens (4,068) as to Black Americans (1,213). For master's degrees conferred by institutions other than the HBC's, foreigners received the same proportion of the total as did Black Americans.

Higher education institutions in 29 states conferred more master's degrees to non-resident aliens than to Black Americans.

Twenty-eight HBC's conferred 22 percent of all master's degrees awarded to Blacks in 1976.

Twenty percent of first professional degrees awarded to Blacks in 1975-76 came from eight HBC's.

In Alabama, all of the veterinary medicine degrees awarded to Blacks in 1975-76 came from Tuskegee Institute.

In the District of Columbia, 92 percent of the dentistry and 84 percent of the medical degrees awarded to Blacks were conferred by Howard University.

Texas Southern University granted two-thirds of all law degrees awarded to Blacks in Texas. North Carolina Central conferred 71 percent of the law degrees awarded to Blacks in North Carolina.

Meharry Medical College conferred 96 percent of the dentistry and 92 percent of the medical degrees conferred to Blacks in Tennessee.

The Committee offers a number of recommendations for actions which would increase and enhance the access to and participation of Black Americans in higher education. A summary of these recommendations follows.

At the secondary school level, recommendations are made to provide better counseling, motivation, and information to Black students, as well as assure better academic/college preparation, prevent misuse of standardized tests and eliminate discriminatory placement of Black students at the elementary/secondary school levels.

In student aid programs, recommendations include better coordination of programs and improved financial aid packaging; monitoring the proprietary schools' treatment of low-income students who qualify for financial aid, assisting with the administrative burden placed on institutions with large numbers of students on financial aid, investigating banking practices which have a negative impact on the ability of low-income/minority students to obtain guaranteed loans, and increasing the pool of available resources and individual awards to Black students.

At the graduate and professional school level, recommendations are made for expanding Black participation in research and development grants and contracts, providing counseling to prospective graduate students on fields where Blacks are underrepresented, and providing means by which the HBC's can escalate their role of providing graduate/professional opportunities to Black students.

Recommendations are offered for ways the Federal Government can improve the monitoring and highlighting of issues related to the higher education of Black Americans by providing comprehensive data collection activities and sensitive analyses.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary

This report describes the access to and participation of Black Americans in higher education and provides a summary analysis of many problem areas which will require continued national, state, regional, local, and institutional attention. However, there are indications of success and of programs which assist in providing increased access. The ultimate goal, and one which must be pursued at various levels, is to prevent the circumstances which require special programs to meet the unique needs and requirements of Black students in all forms of productive postsecondary education.

Improvements are in order at the point at which Blacks first enter the formal education system. Until such time as these occur, however, intervention programs will be necessary if Black and other low-income students are to be afforded the same opportunities for success as the majority group. Some major focus areas mentioned in the foreword of this report will require comprehensive solutions supported by direct actions of the Federal Government. These areas are, restated more specifically:

1. Increasing the high school completion rates of Black students and thereby increasing the pool of students available for higher education.
2. Improving the motivation, counseling, and academic preparation required by Black students to exercise more options in the choice of an institution and major field of study.
3. Overcoming the financial barrier to higher education for larger numbers of Black students.
4. Increasing the participation of Black students at the graduate and professional levels and in fields where there is underrepresentation.
5. Enhancing the unique role of the historically Black colleges and institutions which can continue to enroll and provide supportive services to larger numbers of Black students.
6. Defining the specific needs of Black students at predominantly white institutions and identifying ways in which these institutions can increase their response to the access to and completion of programs by Blacks.
7. Increasing the federal leadership role as catalyst for change at the state, regional, local, and institutional levels.
8. Increasing the federal commitment to access for Black Americans in the legislative process of appropriations and authorization, as well as program operations in the Executive Branch.

9. Developing a more systematic response by federal government agencies to the problems evidenced at all levels of attendance.
10. Providing for more research which will result in new directions and models for success for Black Americans.
11. Coordinating current federal programs designed to serve the economically, educationally, and socially "disadvantaged," so that through coordination these programs are complimentary and mutually helpful.

B. Recommendations

This report, focusing specifically on increasing the participation of Black Americans in higher education, has pointed up some impediments to access and full participation in traditional postsecondary educational experiences. Given these impediments, and current federal programs aimed at equalizing educational opportunities, the following recommendations are offered for future action.

Secondary School Programs

1. That the present federal TRIO programs to increase access to higher education for low-income students be better coordinated with other federal programs such as ESEA Title I, Student Financial Aid Programs, Graduate and Professional Opportunities Program, and so forth, to make all of these programs more effective. That they also be expanded so that more students can participate with better results.
2. That the Upward Bound Program and other successful projects be identified as models and that their characteristics form the basis for evaluating future projects funding applications.
3. That efforts be made on the federal level to create incentives (such as the SSIG programs) for state and local governments to provide appropriate information, preparation, counseling, and motivation regarding higher education to Black students in their secondary schools.
4. That additional projects, similar to that proposed for the biomedical sciences, be initiated.
5. That the federal, state, and local governments and their respective legislative branches work together to develop a program which would enable Black colleges and universities to assist in solving some of the ongoing problems in the elementary and secondary schools with respect to counseling, college preparation of students, and teacher preparation utilizing federal funding for pilot programs and incentives for state and local support.

6. That the federal government provide for research, to be conducted by sensitive persons, which will further define the myriad of problems faced by Black students at the elementary and secondary school level which prevent them from completing high school and continuing on for higher education.
7. That the federal government immediately take steps to prevent the misuse of competency and other standardized tests which discriminate against Black youth and initiate research to measure the detrimental impact of such on Black students.
8. That the federal government equitably and effectively enforce Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and in so doing focus on the elimination of discriminatory treatment of Black students in special education placements, disciplinary actions, ability grouping/tracking and other infringements on the civil rights of Black elementary/secondary school students which create barriers to higher education access.
9. That colleges be encouraged to develop better recruitment methods for enrolling more Black students not only for direct entry into higher education generally, but into four-year colleges or two-year colleges with the potential for smooth transfer into four-year institutions.

Student Aid

1. That the federal government provide better coordination in their financial assistance programs and provide incentives for states and other entities to do the same.
2. That the federal government review the manner in which financial aid is packaged to determine if there are ways of increasing the access of Blacks through improved financial assistance.
3. That the federal government monitor the use of student financial aid funds to support profit-making institutions at the expense of the very students the programs are intended to serve and consider special rulemaking due to the difference between these institutions and traditional higher education institutions.
4. That the federal government recognize the administrative burden placed on institutions with large numbers of students on financial aid and make allowances in the SFA programs to a level based on analysis of real costs as in the case of indirect cost calculations. Further, that these allowances should be in addition to, rather than part of, the allocations awarded based on student needs.

5. That the federal government undertake a study to determine the existence of banking practices which have a negative impact on minority applicants for the Guaranteed Student Loan Program and, based on those findings, immediately take the necessary steps to correct this situation.
6. That the federal government increase the amount of total and individual fellowships available to Black students for graduate/professional study to enable increased participation and allow for full-time study which will result in a swifter production of graduates.
7. That the federal government conduct a comprehensive review, across all agencies, of the uses of fellowships, traineeships, and research assistantships within grants.

Choice

1. That the federal government place major emphasis on the support of concrete interactions (perhaps through appropriation of funds for HEA-Title X) between two- and four-year colleges within states in order to increase the number of students who are able to transfer from the two-year to the four-year college level.
2. That institutions which sponsor Upward Bound and other special services be compelled to enroll and provide aid to a significant portion of their own Upward Bound participants.
3. That state level reviews be made of institutional admissions policies at various types of institutions to determine the reasons for the different enrollment rates for Black and majority students at universities versus four-year colleges and two-year colleges. This could be the responsibility of the statewide planning commissions, but given an impetus by the federal government.
4. That the statewide governance structures be so constituted as to include Blacks at all policy-making levels and in all policy-making bodies.

Graduate and Professional Education

1. That greater opportunities be afforded Black students to participate on major university research projects in fulfilling their graduate assistantships. These expanded opportunities will not only act as a recruitment tool to acquire more Blacks for graduate study but will enhance the research capabilities of the Black students. The federal government can provide incentives to major institutions competing for R&D grants and contracts to encourage responsiveness to that goal.

2. That undergraduate institutions develop programs to increase the "awareness" of Black students who wish to continue on for graduate study and prepare them to enroll in fields and professions where Blacks are underrepresented. These programs could be within the domain of an expanded TRIO program.
3. That the historically Black colleges be provided with funding to expand their present graduate programs and institute programs in new fields to assist in increasing the number of Blacks pursuing graduate study and expand the pool of highly competitive entrants to Ph.D. programs and law and medical schools.
4. That the federal government provide incentive grants to encourage institutions to train Black graduate students in areas with no or low Black faculty representation based on state and regional assessments of need.
5. That programs designed to increase the number of Blacks in graduate/professional programs of study not be meshed with programs intended to serve other underrepresented groups.
6. That stronger relationships be established between Ph.D. degree granting institutions and the 34 HBC's with masters programs to increase the number of Blacks pursuing graduate/professional studies.
7. That majority white institutions examine their total response to Black students' needs (including finances to meet those needs) and increase the number of Blacks in faculty and administrative positions to provide support and reduce alienation for the students.

Data Collection and Analyses

1. That the federal government (within its own information systems or through the support of academic or privately based research centers) systematically assure the collection and analyses of data by race and sex in elementary, secondary, and higher education as a means of monitoring Black progress in higher education.
2. That more policy research centers be established to focus on the issues relating to the participation of Blacks in higher education, either through NIE's auspices or in combination with other related federal programs such as NSF, NCES, OCR, and the Census Bureau. These centers must be staffed and headed by those sensitive to the policy issues relating to Blacks.
3. That the educational research arm of the federal government (NIE) adequately respond to the equity issues related to the education of Black Americans overall.

The recommendations cited above, in many instances, parallel those which have been offered by other groups concerned with equity for Blacks in higher education. The data included in this report, describing the 1976 status of the access of Black Americans to higher education highlights the need to move from recommendations to action. The federal government can be instrumental in ensuring that such action takes place.